UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

•	CIVIL ACTION NO.: 05 10596 NIVIG
THOMAS KELLEY, Plaintiff,	
VS.	
TOWN OF PLYMOUTH and ROBERT J. POMEROY, as Chief of the Plymouth Police Department and	
Individually, Defendants.)

DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR A PROTECTIVE ORDER TO LIMIT THE EXAMINATION OF THE **DEPOSITION OF THE PLAINTIFF, THOMAS M. KELLEY**

Now come the Defendants in the above-referenced matter and hereby oppose the Plaintiff's Motion for a Protective Order to Limit the Examination of the Deposition of the Plaintiff, Thomas M. Kelley (hereinafter "Kelley").

I. **Background**

On May 25, 2003 Kelley, a Plymouth police officer, was participating in mandatory police training session when he experienced chest pains. (See copy of memorandum from Police Chief Robert Pomeroy to the Plymouth town manager, attached hereto as "Exhibit 1"). He was transported to Jordan Hospital. (Exhibit 1). Kelley was placed on sick leave during his absence. (Exhibit 1). Kelley's doctors wrote that he could return to work two weeks from his hospital discharge date and he should stay out of work "for the rest of his vacation time, or about a month." (Exhibit 1).

Thereafter on June 25, 2003, Kelley spoke to Captain Michael Botieri (hereinafter "Botieri") and requested that his use of sick time be changed to vacation time so that he would not be restricted in his activities. (Exhibit 1).

On July 3, 2003 Kelley sent Chief Robert Pomeroy (hereinafter "Pomeroy") notice that he was filing a retirement application pursuant to the "Heart Law". (Exhibit 1). Kelley advised Botieri that he wanted to change his vacation time back to sick time. (Exhibit 1).

On September 8, 2003 Kelley was granted an accidental disability retirement. (Exhibit 1).

Thereafter, Kelley claimed that ten vacation days he used should be changed to injury on duty ("IOD") days. (Exhibit 1). The town denied same, as while Kelley was entitled to the "Heart Law" disability retirement, he was not eligible for 111F benefits (IOD benefits). (Exhibit 1). Kelley's own doctors had written, inter alia, "the patient is being treated by his physician for cardiomyopathy, the cause of which remains unclear." (Exhibit 1). Further, Kelley's doctors reported, "that this is a condition which is likely to have progression because the cause is not known..." (Exhibit 1). Another medical report indicated that Kelley "...has had substernal chest pain with physical and emotional stress since December 2002." (Exhibit 1). Another doctor stated that Kelley had been under his care for years and that more recently he had an incident but that Kelley's "...experience during this training exercise could recur at any time during stress." (Exhibit 1).

On May 26, 2004, Botieri filed a complaint with the Plymouth Retirement Board alleging that Kelley had misused his position on the Plymouth Retirement Board by threatening him. (See copy of letter from Botieri to Plymouth Retirement Board dated May 26, 2004, attached hereto as "Exhibit 2").

The next day the Plymouth Retirement Board for which Kelley was chairman, at Kelley's behest, moved to go into executive session to discuss Botieri's complaint. (See copy of Plymouth Retirement Board Executive Session Minutes dated May 27, 2004, attached hereto as "Exhibit 3").

Kelley filed this suit on March 9, 2005, claiming, *inter alia*, that the denial of 111F benefits was in retaliation for his reporting to the Inspector General's Office that Pomeroy, Botieri, and other superior officers in Plymouth were not entitled to receive certain overtime benefits. (Document 30, *inter alia*, paragraphs no. 48-49).

The defendants have attempted to inquire into the Plymouth Retirement Board's executive session discussions of May 27, 2004 with Kelley. (See copy of Kelley's deposition of June 21, 2006, Volume II, attached hereto as "Exhibit 4", p. 83-89). Kelley has refused to answer these questions at his deposition. (Exhibit 4, p. 83-89).

II. Argument

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 26(b)(1) allows parties to obtain discovery regarding any matter, not privileged, which is relevant to the subject matter involved in the pending action, whether it relates to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or the claim or defense of any other party, including the existence, description, nature, custody, condition, and location of any books, documents, or other tangible things and the identity and location of persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter. The information sought need not be admissible at the trial if the information sought appears reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Fed.R.Civ.P. Rule 26(b)(1).

The Advisory Committee notes for Federal Rule 26 described the purpose of discovery "to allow a broad search for facts, the names of witnesses, or any other matters which may aid a party in the preparation or presentation of this case."

In the case at bar, Kelley's verified complaint alleges, *inter alia*, that as a member of the Plymouth Retirement Board, he was subjected to different treatment than other similarly situated police officers or town employees by the Defendants. (Document 30). Kelley further alleges interference with his activities on the retirement board by the Defendants. (Document 30). At the same time it appears that Kelley may have misused the Plymouth Retirement Board's Executive Session to manipulate an investigation of himself. (See copy of PERAC request to Plymouth Retirement Board for investigation, dated June 3, 2004, attached hereto as "Exhibit 5"). At the very least, the Defendants should be able to explore, through discovery, if this is so.

The Open Meeting Law, M.G.L. c. 39 sec. 23B, provides that executive sessions of governmental bodies may be held for only the limited purposes specifically set out in the section. Porcaro v Hopkinton, 2000 WL 1473038 (Mass. Super.). (Copy of Porcaro case, attached hereto as "Exhibit 6"). This includes consideration of complaints brought against a staff member. M.G.L. c. 39 sec. 23B. The records of each meeting shall become a public record and be available to the public; provided, however, that the records of any executive session may remain secret as long as publication may defeat the lawful purposes of the executive session but no longer. (emphasis in the original). Foudy v Amherst—Pelham Regional School Committee, 402 Mass. 179, 182 (1988). In fact, there is no lawful purpose to keep this executive session secret.

Kelley maintains that the Defendants desire to query him on the discussions held in executive session on Boteiri's allegations is "groundless". In fact, the Defendants seek testimony from Kelley not to annoy, embarrass, or oppress him but to fully examine Kelley's role on the Plymouth Retirement Board and their collective conduct towards Botieri. *De minimus*, Botieri is a key witness in this case. According to Kelley, Botieri is also a potential defendant. (Exhibit 3, p. 2).

The questions for Kelley and his responses are important because part of Kelley's argument is that the Retirement Board activities are completely separate from his police duties. Additionally, Kelley's complaint alleges that Pomeroy, Botieri, and other superior officers circumvented the Town of Plymouth's Bylaws by receiving certain benefits for which they were not entitled. (Document 30). Kelley maintains that because he reported this allegation to the Inspector General's Office he was denied benefits. (Document 30). Yet, at the same time, Kelley, as the Chairman of the Retirement Board, moved to enter executive session to investigate Botieri's complaint against him without hearing from any other witnesses. (Exhibit 3. See also copy of PERAC letter to State Ethics Commission, dated August 11, 2004, attached hereto as "Exhibit 7"). This executive session "investigation" involved a complaint by one of the superior officers (Botieri) Kelley had accused of misappropriating funds.

Kelley's argument that he did not participate in this particular Executive Session is belied by the fact that his presence is noted on the Executive Session Minutes of May 27, 2004. (Exhibit 3). What Kelley apparently did not participate in was the vote to exonerate himself. (Exhibit 3). This goes to the heart of the credibility of the Plaintiff.

Further questions about Kelley's use of executive session are significant in terms of this retirement board. This same retirement board was noted in various newspapers for having spent more money than any other area retirement boards and taking trips for "retirement" seminars in out-of-state venues. (See copy of *Boston Globe* article of November 17, 2005, attached hereto as "Exhibit 8". See also Exhibit 4, p 33). The Plymouth Retirement Board approves its own expenses and travel. (See copy of Plymouth Retirement Board director Debra Sullivan's deposition, attached hereto as "Exhibit 9", p. 37). This same board approved the retirement for Kelley. (Exhibit 4, p. 55-56).

The executive session minutes also indicate that Kelley and the Plymouth Retirement Board may have violated the procedural requirements of M.G.L. c. 23B for holding an executive session. Porcaro v Hopkinton, 2000 WL 1473038 (Mass. Super.). M.G.L. c.23B. 23B mandates that the presiding officer has to cite the purpose for the executive session and the presiding officer has to state before the executive session that if the governmental body will reconvene after the executive session. Porcaro v Hopkinton, 2000 WL 1473038 (Mass. Super.). M.G.L. c.23B. This clearly was not done. (Exhibit 3).

As to Kelley's argument relative to his right to privacy, the Defendants submit that it is groundless. First, *The Boston Globe* has already run a story, including references to the apparently previously released executive session minutes of May 27, 2004. (See copy of *Boston Globe* article of November 13, 2005, attached hereto as "Exhibit 10"). Secondly, Kelley may have used a public forum to attempt to quash an investigation. (Exhibits 7, 10). There were no witnesses called. (Exhibits 7, 10). There is no independent testimony. (Exhibits 7, 10). This potential sham "investigation" should not be allowed to be buried under the

guise of an executive session. As noted, executive sessions also do not remain private forever. <u>Foudy v Amherst –Pelham Regional School Committee</u>, 402 Mass. 179, 182 (1988).

If, as Kelley maintains, the Botieri complaint relates to an incident having nothing to do with any public interests of the Town of Plymouth, then why in the world is Kelley calling for an executive session (public body) on the public's expenditure.

The Plaintiff's Motion for a protective order should not be allowed in an effort to prevent Kelley from responding to questions that have a direct bearing on this case.

III. Conclusion

For the reasons set forth hereinabove, the **Plaintiff's Motion for a Protective Order should be denied.**

Respectfully submitted, DEFENDANTS, ROBERT J. POMEROY and the TOWN OF PLYMOUTH, By their attorneys,

/s/ Jeremy I. Silverfine
Jeremy I. Silverfine, BBO#542779
Leonard H. Kesten, BBO# 542042
BRODY, HARDOON, PERKINS & KESTEN, LLP
One Exeter Plaza
Boston, MA 02116
(617) 880-7100

Dated: 10.30.06

EXHIBIT 1

TOWN OF PLYMOUTH

Filed 10/30/2006

POLICE DEPARTMEN

20 Long Pond Road Plymouth. Massachusetts 02360 FAX (508) 830-4227 (508) 830-4218

To:

Pamela Nolan, Town Manager

From: Robert J. Pomeroy, Chief of Police (V)

Date: January 9, 2004

Case 1:05-cv-10596-MBB

Re:

Officer Thomas Kelley

I am responding to your memo of January 8, 2004 in which you attached a letter from Officer Thomas Kelley.

On May 25, 2003, Officer Kelley was participating in a Police training session when he experienced chest pains. He was transported to the Jordan Hospital. On May 26, 2003, he was transported to Beth Israel Hospital in Boston for further treatment.

Officer Kelley was placed on sick leave during his absence. Office Kelley provided the Police Department with two medical certificates from his physicians. The first note, from Dr. Lydia Bazzano of Beth Israel, is attached. Dr. Bazzano stated only that Kelley may return to work two weeks from his hospital discharge date. The second note, from Dr. Donald Moore, (attached) stated that Kelley had a mild cardiac condition and that he should stay out of work "for the rest of his vacation time, or about a month." Dr. Moore also stated that Kelley's prognosis was good and that he should be able to return to work.

On June 19, 2003, Kelley submitted a notice of injury form and sent an email inquiring if his sick time usage during the incident would be changed to Injury on Duty. Both Captains Chandler and Botieri had already spoken to Kelley and informed him that he would need to submit more medical documentation to support his claim that his illness was job related.

On June 24, 2003, I sent Kelley a letter (attached) explaining the difference between the "Injury on Duty" law and the "Heart Law". I specifically advised Kelley that he must provide the Department with sufficient medical documentation that included a specific diagnosis that clearly indicated that the medical condition was work related. I advised Pat Flynn, Director of Human Resources, of the issue regarding Kelley and faxed her a copy of the letter I sent to Kelley.

On June 25, 2003, Kelley spoke to Captain Botieri. Kelley requested that his use of sick time be changed to vacation time so that he would not be restricted in his activities. Specifically. Kelley stated that he wanted to be able to be out and about and to be able to drink on his boat with repercussions or allegations of sick leave abuse.

On July 3, 2003, Kelley sent me an email (attached) advising me that he was filing a retirement application with the Retirement Board pursuant to the "Heart Law". He now advised Captain Botieri he wanted to change his scheduled vacation time changed back to use of sick time.

On September 8, 2003, Kelley was granted an accidental disability retirement.

On September 29, 2003, Pat Flynn sent you an email (attached) regarding Kelley's claim that ten of the vacation days that he had used should be changed to Injury on Duty days. I reminded Ms. Flynn that for several years, Kelley has tried to persuade the Town to adopt a policy that, if an employee used sick time while waiting for a "heart law" retirement, and if the retirement was approved, that he Town would retroactively restore the employee's sick time and change the sick time to Injury on Duty status. Labor counsel weighed in on this issue and recommended that the Town not adopt such a policy.

On October 28, 2003, Officer Dana Goodwin of the Plymouth Police Brotherhood asked me about Kelley's issue. I later met with Goodwin and gave him a copy of the June 24, 2003 letter that I had sent to Kelley. I advised Goodwin that Kelley has never provided the information requested in the letter.

On November 14, 2003, Kelley came to see me. I advised Kelley that he never provided the documentation required pursuant to the June 24, 2003 letter. Kelley claimed he never received the letter but that he had provided all the necessary paperwork to Pat Flynn. Kelley stated that he would provide me with the paperwork.

On November 19, 2003, Officer Lawrence Rooney of the Plymouth Police Brotherhood gave me the packet of information from Kelley.

On November 20, 2003, I sent Officer Rooney an email asking him to see me regarding the material he submitted on behalf of Kelley.

On November 21, 2001, Kelley went to see Mark Sylvia, Assistant Town Manager, and advised Sylvia that the Chief now had the necessary paperwork and was reviewing it.

On November 24, 2004, I met with Officer Rooney. I advised Rooney that I had reviewed the medical paperwork submitted by Kelley. I advised Rooney that the paperwork indicated the following:

- Dr Moore states that Kelley has been under his care for years and that more recently he "had an incident" while at a training exercise. He also stated "his experience during this training exercise could recur at any time during stress."
 Dr. Moore concludes that Kelley's disability is work related but failed to be specific.
- Dr's. Thakur, Ellison and Philippides report states: "The patient is being treated by his physician for cardiomyopathy, the cause of which remains unclear:" Additionally, the doctors stated, "that this is a condition which is likely to have progression because the cause of this is not known..."
- Beth Israel Cardiac Catherization report: "He has had substemal chest pain with physical and emotional stress since December 2002." (some five months before the claimed injury). The doctor states that Kelley has continued with the same

symptoms and on May 25 (during the training exercise) he experienced a severe episode.

I advised Rooney that Kelley may very well be eligible for retirement under the Heart Law presumption but that there was insufficient evidence to place Kelley on Injury on Duty status.

On November 25, 2003, Kelley came to the station and spoke with Captain Botieri. Kelley gave Captain Botieri another package of material with the message "Give this to the Chief if he wants to stay out of Superior Court,"

On November 26, 2003, Officer Goodwin advised me that he had spoken to Officer Rooney about my conversation with Rooney on November 24 and that he would advise me of further developments.

On December 1, 2003, Rooney again saw me and said the Union was going to discuss this issue further internally. I also received a call from Patrick DelloRusso, Retirement Board Chairman who stated that Kelley had been to see him about this issue. He stated that he advised Kelley that the issue was not a retirement board matter.

On December 3, 2003, I spoke with Pat Flynn again regarding this issue. Ms. Flynn stated that she spoke with you regarding this issue and that you would not support Kelley's claims.

On January 8, 2004, I was informed that Kelley has hired Attorney Joseph Gallitano to represent him and that he will be filing suit in Superior Court regarding this issue.

EXHIBIT 2



TOWN OF PLYMOUTH

POLICE DEPARTMENT

20 Long Pond Road Plymouth, Massachusetts 02360 FAX (508) 830-4227 (508) 830-4218

Plymouth Retirement Board 11 Lincoln Street Plymouth, MA 02360

May 26, 2004

Dear Sirs:

Unfortunately, I must write to file a formal complaint regarding the actions of Mr. Thomas Kelley, acting Chairman of the Plymouth Retirement Board.

As you know, a Plymouth Retirement Board election for two seats is scheduled for June 24, 2004. The two incumbents and one other Town employee, Ms. Lynn Fortini, are running for the two seats. It is well known that Mr. Kelley (a recently retired Plymouth Police officer) is very angry that he is facing opposition in the election. His anger is clearly demonstrated by his outrageous conduct that is the subject of this complaint.

On the evening of May 22, 2004, the Plymouth Police Relief Association hosted a dinner and awards ceremony at the Pinehills Country Club. Later in the evening, at approximately 11: 30pm, Mr. Kelley approached me as he was leaving the function. At that time, I was speaking with Detective Charles Warnock. I extended my hand in order to congratulate Mr. Kelley on his recent retirement. Mr. Kelley shook my hand as he began to question my signing of Ms. Fortini's nomination papers for a position on the Plymouth Retirement Board. I informed Mr. Kelley that I did in fact sign Ms. Fortini's nomination papers. Mr. Kelley became very aggressive as he called me different names using expletives. I then attempted to walk away from Mr. Kelley as I spoke with another retired officer. At this time Mr. Kelley physically grabbed me by the left arm and attempted to pull me towards him saying, "I hope you never have a heart attack and come before the Retirement Board." Detective Charles Warnock quickly intervened and was able to hold Mr. Kelley back from assaulting me further. With the assistance of other officers, Mr. Kelley was eventually removed from the room as he continued his yelling and swearing towards me. I took Kelley's threat very seriously.

This is not the first time that Mr. Kelley has used his position on the Plymouth Retirement Board to make threats against those that disagree with him. On May 8, 2004, during the annual Town election, Mr. Kelley went to the voting precinct located at Town Hall. Mr. Kelley initiated conversation with Officer Stephen Viella, who was on duty during the election. Kelley, very angry and upset, swore at Viella for signing Ms. Fortini's nomination papers. He then threatened Viella by saying "I hope you don't need the

Retirement Boards help some day". Officer Viella had to order Kelley to leave the polling place.

This type of threatening behavior and abuse of his position on the Plymouth Retirement Board is not new to Mr. Kelley. I have just learned that almost one year ago, his supervisor, Sergeant Michael Peddell, admonished Kelley. Kelley, angry and upset, threatened Peddell by saying "I hope you never come in front of the Retirement Board."

Understandably, many of those thirty-two individuals that have signed Ms. Fortini's nomination papers believe that they have been identified by Mr. Kelley as "targets" and that, given the opportunity, Mr. Kelley will exact revenge if these individuals have a matter that appears before the Plymouth Retirement Board.

Mr. Kelley's conduct is despicable, outrageous, and an abuse of his position as an elected official on the Plymouth Retirement Board. Kelley's recent public comments at the Insurance Advisory Committee meeting wherein he was heard to say "we don't need a woman on the Retirement Board" further demonstrates his abusive, harassing demeanor.

In order to maintain the integrity of the Plymouth Retirement Board, Mr. Kelley has but one choice - he must immediately resign from the Plymouth Retirement Board and withdraw from the pending election.

I request that you keep me informed as to what action the Plymouth Retirement Board takes regarding this formal complaint.

Michael E. Botieri Captain of Police

CC: Public Employee Retirement Administration Commission Commonwealth of Massachusetts - Ethics Commission Attorney General Thomas Reilly Town Manager Pamela Nolan **Board of Selectmen**

EXHIBIT 3

DEC.21'2004 03:37 5088304140

TOWN OF PLYMOUTH

#4605 P.001/004

PLYMOUTH RETIREMENT BOARD

Executive Session
May 27, 2004
Town Hall, Mayflower I & II

Mr. Kelley moved the Board go into Executive Session at 9:05 a.m. UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Mr. Duhamel	Yes
Mr. Murphy	Yes
Mr. Kelley	Yes
Mr. Manfredi	Yes
Mr. Madden	Yes

Attorney Michael Sacco was also in attendance to discuss allegations against Mr. Kelley made by Michael Botieri of the Plymouth Police Department. Attorney Sacco summarized the incidents in the order as they occurred. A letter from Captain Botieri was received in the Retirement Board Office on Wednesday, May 26, 2004. This letter was also sent to the Town Manager, Board of Selectmen, PERAC, State Ethics Commission and the Attorney General. In this letter Mr. Botieri states that he had a runin with Mr. Kelley at a Plymouth Police Relief Association retirement party on the evening of May 22, 2004 at the Pinehills Country Club. Capt. Botieri alleges that Mr. Kelley approached him in an aggressive manner and questioned him about signing Ms. Lynn Fortini's Retirement Board election nomination papers. Capt. Botieri states that Mr. Kelley also used several expletives and attempted to grab his arm as he walked away from him, when Detective Charles Warnock intervened and held Mr. Kelley back. He also states that another officer intervened, but made no mention of that officers' name in his letter. He stated in his letter that Mr. Kelley also made remarks to other officers threatening retaliation from the Retirement Board. In addition, Capt. Botieri states that during a recent Insurance Advisory Committee meeting, Mr. Kelly remarked "we don't need a woman on the Retirement Board".

The Board is in receipt of a letter from Mr. Dale Webber, Chairman of the Insurance Advisory Committee, sent directly to Capt. Botieri. This letter, dated June 7, 2004, disputes the allegation made by Capt. Botieri regarding Mr. Kelley's public comment at the above referenced IAC meeting, which took place on May 20, 2004. Mr. Webber states in his letter that he has checked the records with the committees' recording secretary and has found no evidence of such comments, nor does anyone at the meeting remember any such comments being made. Mr. Webber requested that Capt. Botieri retract these allegations immediately, in writing. To date, Mr. Webber has received no response from Capt. Botieri.

The Board is also in receipt of a letter from Officer Robert Hicks. Officer Hicks was also at the Retirement party, was mentioned above in Capt. Botieri's letter and is the second officer that he makes reference to as restraining Mr. Kelley. In his letter, Officer Hicks

DEC 21'2004 03:38 5088304140

TOWN OF PLYMOUTH

#4605 P.002/004

states that Mr. Kelley was called away from a conversation with himself, his wife and Mr. Kelley's wife, by Officer Charles Warnock. He states that a verbal argument ensued between Capt. Botieri and Mr. Kelley and he witnessed Officer Warnock step in between the two men. Officer Hicks states that at this time, he also stepped in, stating "Forget it, it's time to leave", at which time Mr. Kelley left the party with his wife and daughters.

Atty. Sacco explained that the Board has no disciplinary authority against fellow Board members, nor is there anything in the statute that allows or requires the Board to take any action against another Board member. He did state that he felt it was very important to have Mr. Kelley talk about these issues with the Board. Atty Sacco will provide PERAC with an explanation of the issues, as they have asked for an investigation into this matter. He told the Board that he felt it was not necessary to send an explanation to any of the other recipients of the original letter, unless the Board thought it was necessary.

Atty. Sacco stated that this issue was very troublesome for him, as he has always found the members of the Board to be very above-board and hardworking for their membership and found it unfortunate that somebody would make allegations like this against any one of the Members.

Mr. Kelley spoke to the Board regarding the incidents alleged by Capt. Botieri. For the record, he wanted the Board to be aware that he has filed a formal lawsuit against the Town regarding his 111(f) benefits. He explained that he had not been in contact with the Police Department regarding this lawsuit, as Capt. Botieri would be a defendant in this suit. Atty. Sacco asked Mr. Kelley to tell the Board why Capt. Botieri would be a defendant. Mr. Kelley stated that there had been an investigation regarding overtime pay, which Capt. Botieri had received, along with other officers.

Mr. Kelley went on to tell the Board his view of the events on the evening of May 22, 2004. He stated that at the Retirement party referred to by Capt. Botieri, he was called over by Officer Charles Warnock. Mr. Kelley went over and he and Capt. Botieri exchanged words with each other. Mr. Kelley states that Capt. Botieri raised his arm, which was holding a coffee cup, towards him in an attempt to hit Mr. Kelley. Mr. Kelley states that at that moment Officer Warnock, as well as Officer Hicks, stepped in between the two men. Mr. Kelley stated that he left the party at that time with his wife and daughters.

Regarding the allegation Capt. Botieri made of an incident with Officer Stephen Viella, Mr. Kelley stated that the two men briefly exchanged words, but added that Officer Viella never ordered him out of the building, as alleged in Capt. Botieri's letter.

Capt. Botieri stated in his letter that Mr. Kelley was admonished by his supervisor, Sergeant Michael Peddell, almost one year ago. Mr. Kelley stated that he was never admonished by Sgt. Peddell and was in possession of his entire personnel folder, which contained nothing of the sort. Mr. Kelley told the Board that they were welcome to review his file, which he had on hand at the meeting.

Mr. Kelley stated to the Board that he believes that these allegations serve as revenge by Capt. Botieri for the Board's dismissal of the Involuntary Retirement Application filed by the Police Department for Officer Michael Ferazzi. He states that the day after the Board dismissed this application, nomination papers were taken out by another Police Department employee, Ms. Lynn Fortini.

Regarding the alleged comment made at the IAC Meeting, Mr. Kelley stated that there was a room full of people present, including IAC and PREA members, all of whom have have stated that they did not hear any negative comments made by Mr. Kelley, as alleged by Capt. Botieri. Mr. Kelley stated that he never made any statements of that sort, and that this all comes down to two men who have a difference in opinion.

Mr. Murphy asked Atty. Sacco whether or not the Board is required to send a response to PERAC. Mr. Kelley stated that he wanted something sent in order to clear his name and Atty. Sacco agreed that since PERAC has asked for a statement in writing from the Board on this matter, that it would be the proper thing to do.

Atty. Sacco asked the other four Board members if they felt alright about Mr. Kelley's explanation. Atty. Sacco added that his impression of this matter is that of a retaliatory act done by Capt. Botieri.

Mr. Duhamel stated that he was at the IAC meeting in questions, along with the legislative delegation, and that no such comment was made by Mr. Kelley. He noted that he felt it was important that the response to PERAC strongly state that there is absolutely no evidence of Capt. Botieri's allegations. In his opinion, Capt. Botieri was trying to influence the election by making these allegations just weeks prior to the election date of June 24, 2004.

Mr. Kelley felt that he was set up by Capt. Botieri the night of the Retirement party and strongly denies any aggressive acts were made.

Mr. Manfredi asked Atty. Sacco if anybody else needs to be notified of the Board's investigation on this matter. Atty. Sacco suggested sending a copy of the response to PERAC to Capt. Botieri only.

Atty. Sacco stated that he will draft a letter to PERAC for the Board to review at their next meeting. He will also call Joseph Connarton of PERAC and let him know that a response will be forthcoming. Mr. Duhamel added that he would like the other four Board members to sign the letter.

Mr. Manfredi made motion for Atty. Sacco to draft letter for PERAC for the other four members to review and sign. Seconded by Mr. Duhamel.

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED. Mr. Kelley abstained from vote.

DEC.21'2004 03:38 5088304140

John Murphy, Jr.

Shawn Duhamel

John Madden

TOWN OF PLYMOUTH

#4605 P.004/004

Mr. Kelley	Vac
Mr. Manfredi	y e s yes
Mr. Murphy	yes
Mr. Madden	yes
Mr. Duhamel	yes
Mr. Duhamel made moti APPROVED.	on to adjourn. Mr. Murphy seconded. UNANIMOUSLY
The meeting adjourned a	t 9:44 a.m.
	t 9:44 a.m.
Respectfully submitted,	
Respectfully submitted, Wendy Cherry, Assistant	
The meeting adjourned a Respectfully submitted, Wendy Cherry, Assistant Board of Retirement	

EXHIBIT 4

DEPOSITION OF THOMAS M. KELLEY - VOLUME II Page 2 of 21 Case 1:05-cv-10596-MBB ... Pocument 3 Page 3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS INDEX TESTIMONY OF: THOMAS M. KELLEY C.A. 1:05-cv-10596-NMG Page Direct examination by Attorney Silverfine THOMAS M. KELLEY, Plaintiff vs. TOWN OF PLYMOUTH, ET AL, Defendant EXHIBITS Defendant's Page Exhibit No. 6 Letter dated May 10, 2001 18 Exhibit No. 7 E-mail dated September 2, CONTINUED DEPOSITION OF THOMAS M. KELLEY, a 2000 23 witness called for examination by counsel for the Exhibit No. 8 E-mail dated May 8, 2001 23 Defendant, taken pursuant to the applicable provisions of Exhibit No. 9 E-mail dated May 30, 2001 39 the Massachusetts Rules of Civil Procedure, before Exhibit No. 10 E-mail dated July 3, 2003 45 LINDA M. CORCORAN, a Court Reporter-Notary Public in and Exhibit No. 11 Letter dated September 9, for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at the Law Offices 2003 51 Exhibit No. 12 of Joseph R. Gallitano & Associates, 34 Main Street Findings of fact 52 Exhibit No. 13 Extension, Suite 202, Plymouth, Massachusetts, on Letter dated January 14, 2004 61 Wednesday, June 21, 2006, commencing at 2:07 p.m. Exhibit No. 14 Letter dated January 29, 2004 70 Exhibit No. 15 Letter dated May 26, 2004 72 LINDA M. CORCORAN Exhibit No. 16 Executive session minutes CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER dated May 27, 2004 P. O. Box 4 83 Kingston, Massachusetts 02364 Exhibit No. 17 Letter dated June 1, 2004 85 (781) 585-8172 Exhibit No. 18 Letter dated June 3, 2004 89 Page 2 Page 4 APPEARANCES 1 <u>STIPULATIO</u>NS 2 IT WAS STIPULATED AND AGREED by and between On behalf of the plaintiff: 3 counsel for the respective parties that all objections, JOSEPH R. GALLITANO, EŞQUIRE (partial) JOSEPH R. GALLITANO & ASSOCIATES 4 except as to the form of the question, shall be reserved 34 Main Street Extension, Suite 202 Plymouth, MA 02360 5 until time of trial; that motions to strike shall be (508) 746-1500; FAX (508) 747-1150 6 reserved until time of trial; that the witness shall read RICHARD D. ARMSTRONG, JR., P.C. 7 and sign the transcript of this deposition within 30 1400 Hancock Street Third Floor 8 days; however, reading and signing of the deposition Quincy, MA 02169 (617) 471-4400; (617) 471-4404 9 transcript before a notary shall be waived. 10 PROCEEDINGS On behalf of the defendant: 11 THOMAS M. KELLEY, a witness called for JEREMY I. SILVERFINE, ESQUIRE BRODY HARDOON PERKINS & KESTEN, LLP 12 examination by counsel for the defendant, having been One Exeter Plaza Boston, MA 13 satisfactorily identified and having been duly sworn, on 02116 (617) 880-7100; FAX (617) 880-7171 14 oath deposes and continues to testify as follows: 15 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTORNEY SILVERFINE 16 Good afternoon, Mr. Kelley. This is a 17 continuation of the deposition we started on February 9, 2006, in my office, and as a courtesy to you, we're 18 19 continuing your deposition this afternoon. Hopefully 20 we'll be able to finish. If not, we'll finish on some 21 other portion of the afternoon. I'm hoping to finish in 22 the next couple of hours. 23 Continuing on where we left off, same ground 24 rules apply. If you don't understand a question, you LINDA M. CORCORAN, CVR - (781) 585-8172

Page 7 1 have to let me know. If you need me to repeat something 1 And who was your shift supervisor, or who 2 again, please let me know. If there's any reason you 2 monitored your duties as a patrol officer? 3 need a break, also let me know. If you need to speak to 3 Most of the time Kevin Fahy was there and 4 your counsel, also please let me know, and of course, Lieutenant Budge was the shift commander. 5 we'll provide it. 5 What were their duties as shift commanders as 6 (Mr. Gallitano enters the room.) it related to a patrol officer such as yourself? 7 MR. SILVERFINE: Mr. Gallitano has just joined 7 Well, they would make up the daily schedule. Я us. They would bring any new directives or any new 9 MR. GALLITANO: You just keep going, and I'm 9 information most of the time to the attention of the 10 going to be in in a few minutes. 10 officers or any new concerns, extra checks in various MR. SILVERFINE: Fair enough. 11 11 areas for one reason. Vandalism, public drinking, those 12 BY MR. SILVERFINE 12 types of things would be brought to the attention 13 Mr. Kelley, what I'm going to do is basically 13 sometimes by the lieutenant, sometimes by the sergeant. 14 jump in from where we left off last time. Right before 1.4 It depended on the activity of the day. 15 we get there, are you on any medication today? 15 Are the supervisors, your supervisor also, in a 16 Just my regular heart medicine. I take those 16 sense supposed to monitor not only yourself but other 17 five medications. 17 patrol officers in their command? Is that fair to say? 18 ٥. The same ones you mentioned last time? 18 Yes, they did. 19 Α. Yes, yes. I take those daily. 19 What other police officers have served on the 20 Q. Anything new? 20 Plymouth, Retirement Board that you know of since you've 21 Α. 21 been on it? 22 Q. Any change in your job status from the last 22 Α. There's none. 23 time we were there? 23 During the past few years, have you heard of 24 Α. 24 any police officer who ever served on the Plymouth Page 6 Page 8 1 ٥. Anything new? 1 Retirement Board? Are you aware of any? 2 A. No, I'm still retired. 2 Not in the last ten years that I was there. I 3 What I'm going to do is we had marked a number 3 mean, it was just myself. I don't remember anybody prior 4 of exhibits last time. And I'm going to start off as to 4 to that. 5 where we were in our last deposition, where we ended, 5 You have heard discussion about other town 6 which was we were referring to your answers to 6 employees. What other town employees who worked for interrogatories, which is marked as Exhibit 2. So I'm 7 Plymouth also serve on the retirement board while you've 8 going to again -- I'm going to show you Exhibit 2, which 8 been serving there? 9 we've already marked on February 9, and refer you Q You had the building commissioner, and he's specifically as to some of your answers. And we left off 10 10 been the building inspector --11 on Answer No. 7. 11 ο. His name? Do you see where I'm referring to? 12 12 Dick Manfredi. He was from the inspection 13 (Hands to witness.) 13 services division. By statute you have the treasurer as Yeah, yes. 14 designee, and then in the case of us, it's the chief 15 MR. SILVERFINE: Just give me a second. One 15 financial officer. second. Just a moment. 16 16 And who was that? 17 (Pause.) 17 At the time it was Mr. Dello Russo. There was As far as your days as a police officer, is it 18 18 a John Madden there temporarily for a couple of months. 19 a supervisor's duty to monitor a particular shift? 19 What's John Madden's position with the town? 20 Well, the makeup of the department when I left 20 He was an accountant at the time. They were in 21 was you have a patrol supervisor possibly that worked 21 between two financial directors, and he took over while 22 either in your area or there were two, depending on the 22 they hired another guy temporarily. So he had to sit up 23 manning posture. Then you would have a shift commander 23 there, come to the board.

24

Was he actually part of -- what department is

who could be a sergeant or a lieutenant.

24

DEPOSITION OF THOMAS M. KELLEY - VOLUME II Page 4 of 21 Case 1:05-cv-10596-MBB Document 3 Page 11 h ← part of? 1 to discipline if we didn't participate. 2 Α. He would have been a part of the department of So the question is, did you file a grievance? -- the finance department. 3 3 Α. ο. Anyone else you can think of? 4 And just so I understand -- and I thin k you may 5 Right now presently a Bruce Miller, who's now have testified to this before and just briefly mentioned 5 6 there. -- what were your preexisting medical conditions as they 6 7 Q. Where's he from? 7 were right prior to May 25, 2003? В Δ. He's now the finance director. He replaced 8 As I just answered, they were Meniere's 9 Dello Russo. 9 disease. I was under the care for Meniere's disease as 10 Q. Do you know when that was? 10 well as I was on -- I was under Dr. Molloy's car⊜ for Let's see. Geez, I don't remember. Maybe 11 11 Lyme disease. 12 around 2003, 2004, somewhere in that area. 12 And you said you were taking medication for 0. 13 Relative to the Columbine-like drill back on 13 both of them? 14 May 25, 2003, prior to the drill itself, did you object 14 Α. Yes. 15 to participation in that drill? 15 ٥. And you were able to perform the essential 16 A. I was never made aware that an objection would functions of your job as a police officer in your daily 16 17 be entertained. 17 duties? 18 But the question is, did you? 18 There were times prior to the drill there that 19 Α. No, I didn't. 19 I went home from work. I was going to say home from 20 In other words, did you verbalize that you 20 school. Jesus, home from work because of symptoms that yourself had an objection to participate for any reason? 21 21 were attributed to those two things. I couldn't complete 22 Α. No, prior to that I -my shift. I had to be driven home several times. I got 22 23 ο. All right. 23 dizzy spells. And the symptoms of those two type of 24 Α. Excuse me. 24 things -- you get dizzy spells. Sometimes I would be so Page 10 Page 12 1 Q. I'm sorry. I thought you were finished. 1 dizzy I couldn't even drive home, and I would have to 2 Α. No. I wasn't. 2 take the medication and lay down. A couple of times I 3 Q. Okay. 3 called Dr. Durante and met him. My wife would drive me Prior to that I did notify the town as a result 4 to his office, and he would examine me. He could tell 5 of receiving a letter from the chief regarding sick time 5 that you were having a Meniere's attack. of two illnesses that I had been treated for with 6 6 Referring to Exhibit 2, Interrogatory No. 10, doctors' notes. I gave them to Botieri. And one was for 7 which states: (Reading) Please set forth all the facts Meniere's disease. I was under Dr. Durante's care for 8 8 which rely on the alleged defendants were aware of your 9 that as well as Lyme disease, and I was under the care of 9 preexisting medical condition and that the May 25, 2003, Dr. Molloy for that. And I brought in those doctors' 10 10 drill would aggravate that medical condition (end 11 notes and gave them to Mr. Botieri in hand. 11 reading), you answered: (Reading) Based on the medical 12 First of all, when did you do that? ٥. 12 notes on record in my personnel file (end reading). 13 I would say that might have been -- I think the 13 Do you see that? letters come out like in March/April, in that area. 14 14 Uh-huh. Yes, I'm sorry. Yes. 15 Around the April area. 15 Besides what you've just referenced, are there 16 And did you specifically object or make 16 any medical notes that you say on record in your reference to your not wanting to participate in that 17 17 personnel file that were present prior to May 25, 2003? 18 drill? 18 Not that I'm aware of. 19 Α. No, I never made any. 19 Are you aware of any obligation anyone from the 20 ο. Either in writing or verbally? 20 police department has to review medical notes in your 21 Α. Never was aware of it. 21 personnel file? 22 Did you make any grievance as to participation 22 Well, going back to my previous answer and your in the drill of May 25, 2003, prior to the drill? 23 23 question, I explained I believe earlier in the deposition 24 We were told it was mandatory. We were subject that on a yearly basis we are given a letter from the LINDA M. CORCORAN, CVR - (781) 585-8172

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

chief who reviews everyone's file about the use of sick time. And at that point everybody gets a generic letter, and it states you might have used five days, twelve days. This particular year I believe I used twenty-three days. Or it indicates how many full days you used and how many half days you used, like if you got sick at 12 o'clock and you went home sick type of thing. And that was signed by the chief. That was a contractual item that the chief was required to do on an annual basis, and it was for the protection of both sides.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

If you felt that the letter was not representative of your sick time, you could produce medical records that would say you have a legitimate reason for these times, and I exercised that right. And I also then e-mailed the chief indicating that I gave him -- and we have that, I believe, in the production of documents. I e-mailed him indicating that I gave those medical records, those medical notes to Mr. Botieri, and I was requesting him to review that and then retract his letter from me because I felt that it was a legitimate use of sick time. I did that twice, and I never received an answer back from him, and he never retracted his letter. He never responded to my request.

0. This amount of sick time you used, was that

Page 14

twelve days prior to May 25, 2003?

- No, it would have been a cumulative of a year, say, from, oh, April 30 to the previous April 30. It's like a calendar annual basis. At some point they stop and they say, okay, from this point back a year, use the following days. We had -- I believe there's a copy of it in their documents as well.
- Do you know what the date, that anniversary date you were referring to is?
- I don't know, but it's in the documents that I think you produced or we produced. It is in there.
- Other than what you've now testified, did you do anything else to notify the chief or the town of your medical condition prior to May 25, 2003?
- No, those -- like I said, the letter is signed by the chief. It is part of a contractual obligation that he has to review, so he would have had knowledge of it being there. And I never received a response after $\ensuremath{\text{I}}$ justified my days.
- Q. Again, in Exhibit 2, your answer to Interrogatory 11 says: (Reading) Please set forth all communications you had with any union representative prior to May 25, 2003, drill regarding your inability to participate due to your preexisting medical condition

(end reading). And your answer was: (Reading) The union president was to hold a membership meeting with the chief on the issues and concerns about my preexisting medical condition and inability to participate in the drill (end reading).

Is that correct?

- I don't particularly remember it being written like that, but I remember there was a question about individuals that have had issues. And I believe we just found out this morning that there were two individuals that were excused through some process that I don't know.
- My first question is, that's what you wrote back in Exhibit 2 on August 25, 2005, under oath?
 - Right, right.
- And my question is, if I could have it, do you recall when that meeting you say with the chief was?
- I believe they had a discussion on the Columbine issue and all the training program and some of their concerns in their impact bargaining session with the AR-15s prior to that. It was maybe a month or month and a half before.
 - And who was present at that meeting?
- I believe Paul Boyle was, Dana. I believe the chief was.

1

ο.

Dana? Dana Goodwin.

And I believe the chief and Captain Botieri were there.

- And do you know what was discussed?
- I know they discussed that, and they discussed the impact bargaining, I believe, on the use of the AR-15s.
 - What information are you aware of that they discussed your preexisting medical condition and your inability to participate in the drill?
 - I'm not aware of any -- I'm not aware of any exact language. I wasn't there.
 - I'm just trying to follow up on -- because what you wrote in your answer was you were to bring up a meeting -- concerns about preexisting medical condition and inability to participate in the drill.

So what information, if any, are you aware of that was brought up?

- I don't have any information of what specifically because I don't have any notes of that meeting or anything like that. I just know that they did discuss. They had concerns as the union for individuals.
 - Do you know in your conversations with Paul

Page 16

Page 15

DEPOSITION OF THOMAS M. KELLEY, VOLUME II Page 6 of 21 Page 17 Page 19 Bayle and Dana Goodwin whether they mentioned 1 1 defendant.) specifically that they brought up concerns about you and 2 2 MR. SILVERFINE: Okay, we'll continue while Joe arry preexisting medical condition? 3 3 is making copies. I don't know if they brought -- I don't recall 4 BY MR. SILVERFINE 5 if they said specifically, you know, but they did say 5 On Exhibit 6 this is a letter you wrot € to triat they did speak with him or tried to speak with him 6 6 Eleanor Beth, who was then town administrator? 7 about the concerns that they had from other drills and She was the town manager. 8 other towns, and they tried to address some of those 8 Town manager. And your complaints had to do ο. 9 concerns. 9 with harassment as it related to the discrepancy in pay In Interrogatory No. 15 on Exhibit 2, it 1.0 Q. 10 records as you saw it? 11 states: (Reading) Please set forth all facts on which 11 Α. What it was, as you can see from the letter -you rely where you allege Chief Pomeroy was aware that 12 12 ο. 13 you reported him to the Inspector General's office 13 If you want to follow it down with me, we can Α. regarding his compensation for educational benefits (end 14 14 15 reading), and you answered: (Reading) Town manager 15 ٥. Yeah, go ahead. Eleanor Beth told me in her office that Pomeroy was aware 16 16 Α. Follow this one right here. of the Inspector General office investigator. I wrote of 17 17 Q. Okav. 18 the harassment on the job (end reading). 1.8 I went to go see her prior to this letter being Α. Where did you write of the harassment on the 19 written, discussing as being a member of the board 19 20 iob? 20 elected to the position in the fund as well as a town 21 Α. It's in the documents that we produced to you. 21 meeting member. There were some serious questions of the 22 Q. Do you know which documents particularly you're 22 personnel bylaw and how it relates in being employed in 23 referring to? 23 the police department. There was no provision for Quinn 24 If you want to go off the record, I can get it. Bill or holiday money or vacation money or overtime, 24 Page 18 Page 20 1 ο. Can you remember --1 which was an ongoing practice in it. And having 2 Α. It's in the minutes. I'd have -- you'd have to 2 experience in municipal finance and having experience 3 go through the --3 with collective bargaining, employees are paid in three 4 Q. All right, that's fine. criteria. They're paid pursuant to a personnel bylaw, if 5 MR. SILVERFINE: We'll go off the record. they're a member of it; a collective bargaining 5 (Discussion off the record.) 6 agreement; or a contractor relationship which they're MR. SILVERFINE: Back on the record. 7 7 eligible. 8 Mr. Kelley is just showing me a letter that 8 In the case that I was bringing to her appears to be provided, Exhibit 3 of document 9 9 attention, which involved town meeting monies and 10 production and voluntary disclosure. It's a letter 10 retirement monies and disbursement of funds, there was no from -- it looks like from Mr. Kelley to Mrs. Beth 11 11 mention of Quinn Bill, holiday money, vacation money, and 12 dated May 10, 2001. 12 overtime that was being paid on an ongoing basis at the 13 And perhaps -- could I get a copy of this and 13 police station in the bylaw that governed the employment 14 just mark it so it's clear on the record? 14 of the police captains and the police chief. The bylaw MR. GALLITANO: Sure. Do you want three 15 15 by the Town of Plymouth's adoption, the way they 16 copies, you think? 16 establish their own bylaw, is pursuant to Chapter 41, MR. SILVERFINE: That would be great. Just so 17 108A, which says in a city or town -- in a town by a vote it's clear on the record. 18 of the town meeting, they can establish a personnel (Pause off the record.) 19 bylaw. Town meeting had never seen these numbers, had MR. SILVERFINE: Why don't we mark this as 20 never seen these benefits. It never went through the Exhibit 6. 21 personnel bylaw. And come to find out it was ongoing for

22

23

over 15 years, and benefits were also being given without

authorization of the bylaw to members of the fire

department. Those benefits and payroll numbers were

(Whereupon, a letter dated

May 10, 2001, was marked as

Exhibit No. 6 for the

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Case 1:05-cv 12 POSMIRON OPOPHONIAS TWO KELTILEY 1 WAN AME II Page 7 of 21

Ŕ

1.1

Page 2

given to the retirement board, which would then formulate a benefit and calculation pursuant to the individual member's group, age, and salary. Pursuant to the regulations generated by Chapter 32 CMRs specifically indicate as well as the board policy that we will check and back up every number that's in a computation with the governing document. And from the governing document in this case, it would have been the personnel bylaw. To the payroll there was a 30 to 35 percent discrepancy.

1 =

At that point I spoke to Mr. Botieri with Mr. Rooney present in his office and explained to him the severity of this issue in the event that something happened to one of them or anybody in that category. I had spoke to board counsel from the retirement board, and he said, "Tom, you have to bring it to the attention of the town in some form or fashion, but get it done" because of the Needham issue where an auditor walked in to the Needham Retirement Board. There were mistakes made by the Needham board for internal tabulations of monies. An auditor ordered the people to pay the money back over — it was like a 20-year period that this went on for. And the individuals that were out, the members, didn't even realize this happened. It wasn't their mistake.

Page 22

- Q. Now, did you also file complaints about the fire department to anyone?
- A. No, I didn't even know it was going on till we went -- we dug into it deeper.
 - Q. When was that?
- A. When Eleanor Beth looked into or -- when Eleanor Beth finally -- how do I say this? When Eleanor Beth looked into it, she found that this practice was going on in the fire department as well.
 - Q. Do you remember when that was?
- A. That was just around the time that I wrote this letter to her she started.
 - Q. This was around May 10, 2001?
- A. This letter here. After that she started to look into it.
 - Q. When you complained about the police department, were you complaining about all the police department or just about Chief Pomeroy?
 - A. I was complaining about the actions of Captain Botieri and Chief Pomeroy.
 - Q. Anyone else?
 - A. No.
- Q. Besides -- you were kind enough to give me copies of --

A. We have other e-mails here as well.

- Q. The other e-mails in your production are the examples of what you say you wrote about the harassment; is that correct?
 - A. Right, correct.
- Q. And just for the record, why don't we mark these as Exhibit Nos. 7 and 8, which are -- looks like an e-mail from you on September 2, 2000. We'll mark that as Exhibit 7. And then an e-mail of May 8, 2001, from you we'll mark as Exhibit 8.

(Whereupon, e-mails dated September 2, 2000, and May 8, 2001, were marked as Exhibit Nos. 7 and 8 for the defendant.)

BY MR. SILVERFINE

- Q. And when you were forwarding, for instance, this e-mail in Exhibit 7, which is your September 2, 2000, e-mail --
 - A. Which one are you on? I'm on the second one.
 - Q. This says meeting September 1, 9-month --
 - A. Okay, I have that one.
- Q. Who did you send that to? It says Kelley and Goodwin.

Page 24

Page 23

- A. I sent that to -- Dana Goodwin was present at the meeting on the 1st.
- Q. Did you send that to Captain Botieri or Chief Pomeroy or anyone else?
- A. No, but they have access to -- it's what they call systems manager. They can look into any e-mail at any time.
- Q. My question is, did you send this -- did you forward this to Botieri or Pomeroy or to Eleanor Beth?
- A. According to that format, no, I didn't. I kept it in my documentation.
- Q. And Exhibit 8, which looks like an e-mail from you to -- it looks like yourself, Boyle, and Botieri, did this have to do with the vacation time you were referring to? Is that right? Why don't you take the original.

(Hands to witness.)

- A. Yes.
- Q. And that's what you were referring to when we discussed a few minutes earlier about your decision with the vacation time?
- A. In the e-mail I indicate that I had put in for a month's vacation in June and a month's vacation for July. I had accrued time towards the end of the fiscal year, which would be June, and accrued time starting in

	DEPOSITION OF THOM Case 1:05-cv-10596-MBB Document	AS M	KELLEY 10/30/2006 II Page 8 of 21
,	Page 25		Page 2
1	July 1. And I had put in time for that over 60 days	1	cover two areas, and if it was a long meeting, they'd be
2	prior to it. I believe the date what's the date on + mere?	2	pretty upset that they'd have to cover my area. Some of
3	•-	3	them were sympathetic. They realized that I was doing a
4	Q. May 8, 2001.	4	volunteer job for their best interest and elected to the
5	A. Yeah, right.	5	position. Some of them really didn't care about
6	Q. Just so I'm clear, besides what we've marked	6	anything. They were just upset, and it was difficult
7	h⊜re, you've also indicated in your production would	7	sometimes reasoning with them, that I can't help it if
8	iriclude any and all notices or letters, e-mails you sent	8	they're not going to hire somebody to cover the $oldsymbol{e}$ xtra
9	as to any harassment that you thought you were	9	position because I'm out. They are getting a charge back
10	uradergoing, right?	10	for it.
11	A. To the best of my knowledge, that I had. What	11	Q. What's a charge back?
12	was available.	12	A. They were charging back money from the
13	Q. In other words, there's no other documents	13	retirement system, and they indicated to people that they
14	other than	14	did that for the purposes of coverage, but they never
15	A. Not that I can think of.	15	covered me.
16	Q what you've already produced to us?	16	Q. Did any of the officers express their, for lack
17	A. If I could find if I have something, I'd	17	of a better word, anger or
18	gladly give you a copy of it.	18	A. Yes.
19	Q. In Interrogatory No. 16 on Exhibit 2, you make	19	Q disappointment to you?
20	a listing of all your treating physicians. Is there	20	A. Absolutely. All the time.
21	anyone else that's not	21	Q. Which officers?
22	A. No.	22	A. Anybody that was I mean, you could go back.
23	Q listed there?	23	They'd have a multiple car accident and then have to go
24	A. No. We went over this, believe me, before.	24	to another one, and they'd be going all the time. They
	Page 26		Page 28
1	MR. ARMSTRONG: Well, there is. I mean,	1	never covered me, so it put the pressure on all the other
2	corrected in the first	2	people.
3	THE WITNESS: I did correct that.	3	Q. Name some of the officers that you recall that
4	Q. I'm just asking if there's anybody else.	4	
5	A. No more since then. No more since then.	5	A. It was day shift. It would be the day shift.
6	Q. That's what I'm asking. I just want to make	6	I mean, I can't name specific names. It's almost four
7	sure that we have all the medical providers. Thank you.	7	years ago or so or better, but it happened all the time
8	A. We do, right.	8	over my career there on the time.
9	Q. I don't know if I asked you this last time, and	9	Q. Do you know if those complaints went up the
10	if I did, forgive me, but I just want to understand.	10	chain of command to
11	Did the town have to hire or pay any other	11	A. I remember Lieutenant Fahy and Captain Skip
12	police officer to cover your shift when you went to the	12	Budge indicating to people that they never covered me and
13	retirement board meeting?	13	"They should be covering you." And that was a decision
14	A. They never did.	14	made by the second floor, and they couldn't do anything
15	Q. To your understanding, how would they cover	15	about it.
16	your sector when you went to a retirement board meeting?	16	Q. You had produced a note to the town after May
L 7	To your understanding.	17	25, 2003, relative to your condition and I'm sure I'm
18	A. Another officer would be assigned my position	18	going to mispronounce this cardiomyopathy. Do you
19	and have to cover two areas. They would run short on the	19	remember that?
20	shift. I believe Captain I believe Lieutenant Fahy	20	A. If you have the document, I'll look at it. I
21	indicated that as well the other day.	21	don't mean to be
22	Q. To your knowledge, did that ever create any	22	Q. I have it somewhere.
23	problems as far as coverage to your understanding?	23	A. There are numbers of them.
4	A. I can tell you that officers would have to	24	Q. Do you remember if the note indicated that the

1.2

Page 30

Page 29

condition that you were suffering was caused by the job relative to cardiomyopathy?

- A. No. If you'd show me a document, I'd be able to specify exactly what you're talking about.
 - Q. But do you have any independent recollection?
- A. No, I don't. I'd have to see it in front of me. We've got 5-inch stacks of paper here. I'm not trying to be argumentative. "I just...
 - Q. All right, I understand.

1,1

Were you angry that Chief Pomeroy was scrutinizing your absence from work due to the retirement board participation?

A. I was annoyed because of -- no one else was scrutinized like that. I was constantly, you know -- people at work would be saying, "They're out to get you. They're out to get you." I had other people on the board that turned around and ridiculed and were saying, "Oh, you better get over there quick. They're counting the minutes."

I felt the whole thing was unnecessary because they gave us a bill for those hours, and we wouldn't have paid it if I wasn't there. Number two is our minutes of the meeting indicate when the meeting starts and when it ends. That charge back was handled by the administrator

who would be at the meeting. So if they charged me -- if they charged the retirement system for time that I wasn't there or too much or too little, she would make that change or she would object to paying it and bring it to the board's attention. That never happened. I was at every meeting that I was supposed to be at.

- Q. Were you angry that Captain Botieri --
- A. I wouldn't justify it as angry. I justify it as harassment in a sense. No, not angry where it's anger, a different meaning of the word.
- Q. Were you angry at Captain Botieri for scrutinizing your absence from work due to retirement board participation?
- A. I was annoyed by it. I was embarrassed by it. It was as if I was trying to put something over on them when they had all the checks and balances already there. I believe they did that purposely so that if I was ten minutes late, they would say, "Oh, you must have been doing this. You must have been doing something else" and try to...
- Q. While you were or have been on the retirement board, has there ever been any allegations against you that you misused funds in your position on the retirement board?

A. Absolutely not.

- Q. Did you as part of your retirement board work take trips?
- A. We have conferences that we have to go to and are required to. I run over \$100 million and nine managers.
- Q. And approximately how many seminars do you attend a year as a retirement board member?
- It varies. It depends on -- it depends if we're looking for a new manager for an international fund. It depends on market conditions. It depends on a number of factors. I mean, if markets are good. everybody's pretty happy just trying to make what you're making. If markets are bad, everybody's scrutinizing things. You know, there are new instruments financially coming out every day. There are new companies. Companies change hands. Individuals change hands. All our contracts on the board are manager specific. They have specific articulate conditions that have to be met to meet a certain asset class. Every one of those conditions and contract is articulate. There's nothing ambiguous. So if there's a change, we bring that manager in. We meet with them, or we go somewhere to meet with them because each one of them have a substantial amount

Page 32

Page 31

of money. And one change in an asset class can affect our whole portfolio.

- Q. During the time period you've been on the retirement board, how many seminars do you attend a year?
- A. Again, I said we have a state conference one that we attend spring and fall. Sometimes, depending on one of the big issues lately has been the GASB 45 issue, which in this state the way the legislation is being worked through the statehouse is going to end up the responsibility of the retirement system. I have been following that issue for almost ten years now. It's going to be a major financial undertaking for our retirement system. I have attended seminars indicating the impacts of GASB 45, which is your unfunded medical for retirees, how it's being funded, how it's being handled in different states so that we can be ahead of the curve when this number comes into the when we have to declare it, and it's in 2007. There's a lot of work to put that together.
- Q. What happened to your duties as a police officer when you attended a trip on behalf of the retirement --
- A. I would notify Mr. Botieri in an e-mail indicating that I'd be on board business and I'd be at a

22

23

They have that -- you know, I've seen them all the time.

It's like an overall. It's like a suit that they wear.

It's like a work suit. You know what I'm trying to say?

No, I don't know how it got there. I don't

know how you would have got your hand into that lawfully.

Well, I think you told me about.

22

23

24

Page 37 1 How do I explain it other than ---- and I'm going to show you a copy and give a copy to 2 MR. GALLITANO: SWAT team. 2 your counsel -- to yourself, Officers Boyle, Budge, and 3 It was a SWAT team suit that they all wear, and 3 Botieri relating to a surgery that was scheduled for June 4 it's a standard. They were all dressed in that. It's 4 11. 20012 5 like a one-piece thing that they zip up, and it's heavy 5 (Hands to witness.) 6 material, and maybe it's fireproof. I don't know. I 6 A. Yeah, I was injured. I had -- this was -- I 7 never wore one. 7 remember this was Mother's Day. As a matter of fact, the 8 ο. In terms of the active shooter drill, that injury report is in the file as well. We arrested an 8 Columbine drill, is it fair to say the department gave 9 9 individual for assaulting his wife. And myself and 10 you and the members at least a month's notice that the 10 Officer Kennedy went to the house, and we had a struggle 11 drill was coming up? 1.1 with him down a flight of stairs, and I got a hernia in 12 Not at all. Α. 12 my stomach from it. 13 0. How much notice do you say you got? 13 And when you say surgery, is this the surgery 14 I came into work one day, and they said, "You 14 you're referring to in this e-mail? 15 have to do it in a week." 15 Yeah, I went to the hospital that day, and then 16 Are you saying you got a week's notice? 16 I spoke to -- I contacted a surgeon, Dr. Zazzarino, who I 17 We got it on the board. We don't get notices 17 know, and he did the surgery, which was scheduled for the 18 like, "Come and talk to us." We just get a piece of 18 11th. I was working with a brace around me on my 19 paper stuck on the wall by Botieri, signed by Botieri 19 stomach. 20 saying, "You have to go. If you don't go -- you're 20 MR. SILVERFINE: Let's just for the record mark assigned this day -- you're subject to discipline." 21 21 this as Exhibit 9. 22 That's in the rules and regulations. 22 (Whereupon, the e-mail 23 Are you aware that there were several other 23 dated May 30, 2001, was 24 officers who were excused for participation for health 24 marked as Exhibit No. 9 for Page 38 Page 40 1 reasons? 1 the defendant.) 2 Α. I was never aware of that till today, till I 2 BY MR. SILVERFINE 3 heard him testify. 3 Q. And relative to Exhibit 9, second paragraph, ο. Forgive me. John Abbott, is that his name? 4 you indicated that you would be attending a retirement 5 Right. I never knew that. Α. 5 conference? 6 ٥. Dennis Govoni? 6 Α. IIh-huh Govoni. Portuguese. You've got to say it like 7 Α. 7 Do you see that? 8 Govoni. 8 Yeah. Α. g ο. Fair enough. q ٥. Where is that, do you recall? 10 Were you aware that he was excused? 10 That would have been what they call the MACRS 11. I never knew that till this morning. 11 conference, Massachusetts Association of Contributory 12 MR. SILVERFINE: Give me a second here. 12 Retirement Systems. That was an advocacy group that 13 (Pause.) 13 represents all 106 retirement systems in the I'm going to ask you some questions about some 14 14 . Commonwealth, which I am a member of the executive board documents, some of which I believe you --15 15 from that. 16 Α. What do we do with -- are these all -- okay, 16 Now, did you attend a conference for the 17 I'm sorry. Go ahead. 17 retirement board sometime in the fall of 2002? ٥. Just procedurally we take these. 18 18 I could have. 19 Α. I thought you were --19 Was there some discussion about filing or No, no. That's okay. You're welcome to look 20 ٥. 20 preventing people from receiving their retirement 21 at them, but they're just documents that we mark that 21 benefits if there was a criminal complaint or action become part of your deposition exhibits. Your counsel 22 22 against them? 23 will have copies. 23 I couldn't tell you the agendas of those. I'd 24 Back in May 30 of 2001, did you send an e-mail have to look at the agendas. There are all kinds of

б

Page 41

d@cisions.

1.1

Are you familiar with DALA, Division of Acministrative Law Appeals? Are you familiar with that agency? Are you familiar with that? I just want to clarify my question. If I can't --

Q. I'm not familiar with it.

A. Okay, what it is, it's -- in the administrative process to retirement, okay, there is -- we make a decision as a board. If you're an aggrieved party and you're a member, you can go and you appeal it to the Di vision of Administrative Law Appeals. It's your administrative relief. Then there is what they call -- after DALA there is CRAB, Contributory Appeals Board. And then from that point we go into superior court on a point of law, and then if you have another point of law, you appeal to the appellate courts up the ladder.

Every time that we have a conference with MACRS, spring and fall, we have the DALA magistrates come. Okay, we have Chris Connolly (phonetic), who's the chief magistrate, as well as Kimberly Fletcher. They come and they discuss the recent decisions, the precedent-setting decisions with all the boards, and they bring everybody up to speed on how things are interpreted, how new decisions are interpreted from the

Page 42

SJC and all those things that affect the administration of the board from a trustee point of view down to your administrators. It's a scheduled conference time. I don't know what the agenda is, to be honest with you.

Q. So my question is, sometime in the fall of 2002, did you attend some kind of seminar where you heard about denying people their retirement benefits if they had a conviction or a criminal complaint against them?

A. I couldn't -- I couldn't qualify the exact date or time. I know those issues have been brought up in the courts. We've just recently done one just last week where they put no statute of limitations on that statute. It was actually ten years old. That was just last week.

Q. And that's something if someone commits some on-the-job fraud you can deny them retirement, words to that effect?

A. The way that statute's been -- I want to just say interpreted through the SJC in this state the last five years has been very broad-based. It's very -- just the limitations -- just the other day we had a meeting, a week ago, last week, where our counsel, Mike Sacco, brought to the attention a recent SJ decision that was just passed down on the 10th of June that indicated that there's no statute of limitations on that particular

statute. And it was involving a case where an individual -- he forfeits his pension, and it was over ten Years ago the incident happened, but they were able to somehow adjudicate it. And I didn't read it totally, but it basically said there is no statute of limitations for this statute where some people thought it was five years. And the SJC said no, it's wide open.

Q. Did you ever yourself bring this to the retirement board that we have to crack down on these kinds of cases where there's been --

A. No.

Q. -- a criminal complaint or --

A. No, no. We have an obligation. For an example, we had some individuals -- excuse me -- I have to go off record for a minute. I can answer that in a minute because it involves two things. There's a conflict.

 $\ensuremath{\mathtt{Q}}.$ Well, there's a standing question in front of you.

A. Well, it's a conflict. I don't want a conflict on a question.

Q. Well, if you have a standing question, you're obligated to finish it. Then if you need to talk to counsel --

Page 44

A. There was a case before us on a forfeiture issue, okay, that we had to hold a hearing regarding the forfeiture issue, and we found that there was no crime committed that was applicable to the individual's office, and the individual was able to retire.

THE WITNESS: Now I need to go off the record, okay?

MR. SILVERFINE: Okay.
(Short recess was taken.)

BY MR. SILVERFINE

Q. Right before we broke I had asked you if you had supplied any information. How about do you know a former officer named Furtado?

A. Police officer now?

Q. Yeah.

A. Yeah, Daryl -- Daryl's dead.

MR. GALLITANO: Daryl's dead.

18 A. Kevin, Kevin Furtado.

Q. Did you ever supply him with any information as to crackdown on retirement benefits as they pertained to applications for criminal complaints or convictions?

A. No.

Q. And in particular as it related to former town ager Eleanor Beth? Case 1:05-cv-10596 MBBON OF THOMAS M. KELLEY - VOLUME II Page 13 of 21

	Page 45		Dags 47
1	A. No.	1	Page 47 Q. No, May 25. I'm assuming you
2	Q. I'm going to show you another e-mail which I	2	A. Oh, yeah, two days later.
3	ask you if you recognize.	3	Q. I'm assuming you're sick. You went to the
4	(Hands to witness.)	4	hospital, right? That's your heart, right?
5	Q. Do you recognize that?	5	A. Oh, yeah, yeah.
6	A. Yes.	6	Q. Right?
7	Q. And is that an e-mail that you authored?	7	A. Yes, yes. Okay, I'm getting you're
8	A. Yes, I did.	8	right.
9	MR. SILVERFINE: Let's mark as Exhibit No. 10.	9	Q. May 25 you have the Columbine incident, right?
10	(Whereupon, an e-mail dated	10	A. Uh-huh.
11	July 3, 2003, was marked as	11	Q. When you went out May 25 from there, were you
12	Exhibit No. 10 for the	12	on sick time at that point?
13	defendant.)	13	A. Sick time, I believe I mean, vacation time,
14	BY MR. SILVERFINE	14	I believe.
15	Q. Showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 10,	15	Q. Vacation time?
16	you sent this on it looks like July 3, 2003?	16	A. Right.
17	(Hands to witness.)	17	Q. Did you ask to be put on vacation time so that
18	A. Yes, that's the day that I used I had to use	18	nobody would, you know, bother you, so to speak?
19	Skippy Budge's Lieutenant Budge's computer because	19	A. No, when I came home from the hospital, I had
20	mine for some reason wasn't working. My access to it	20	only preliminary reports from the doctors from there,
21	wasn't working.	21	which were not anything that they were only attending
22	Q. Just help me on this, if you would. In the	22	physicians. I had made an appointment with my doctor. I
23	e-mail itself, it says you requested I'm reading about	23	believe I wrote a preliminary report that I gave to the
24	halfway down that vacation time that was scheduled on	24	chief via fax from my house and my own computer
-			
	Page 46		Page 48
1	July 1, 2003, should be changed to sick time. Do you see	1	indicating to him that I would be seeing my doctor prior
2	that in the middle of the second paragraph?	2	to I think it was the 21st I saw my doctor of June.
3	A. Right, I had sick time I had vacation time	3	And we had the complete file and the results of the
4	starting July 1, and I filed the application, and I put	4	cardiac catheterization. At that point I then determined
5	in change that to sick time, correct. I had a sick bank.	5	from talking in counsel with my doctor and my personal
6	Q. Up until that time from the point you went out	6	friends and stuff that I have to put my papers in to
7	on May 25, 2003, were you using sick time?	7	retire.
8	A. I went in one day, and I was just out of the	8	Q. Back in June 25, 2003, did you speak to Captain
9	hospital. I wasn't feeling well, and I said to Captain	9	Botieri about this sick time and vacation time?
10	Botieri or somebody up there I remember saying, "Just	10	A. All I said to him at that I saw him at the
11	put me on for vacation right now," and then I left the	11	town hall, like it says, and I said I just put in my
12	place.	12	papers that day I believe a couple of days before
13	Q. So as of May 25 when you left, you were on	13	that, and then I wrote this to the chief. I said, "Put
14	vacation time?	14	me in for sick time because I put my papers in as of this
15	A. I believe that day there I was they charged	15	date."
16	I don't know if they could charge me sick time or	16	Q. Back on June 25, 2003, did you request that
17	they didn't pay me. They actually didn't pay me the full	17	your use of sick time be changed to vacation time so you
18	day. They only paid me half a day, and then I was off,	1.8	would not be restricted in your activities?
19	and then I went in I think I spoke to someone on the	19	A. Not at that point, no. I put in for sick time
		ļ	
20	phone or I did something after. I don't exactly	20	then because I had additional time and I knew ${\rm I}{}^{{}_{1}}{\rm d}$ have to
21	phone or I did something after. I don't exactly remember.	20 21	then because I had additional time and I knew I'd have to retire and I was putting my application in.
21 22	phone or I did something after. I don't exactly remember. Q. Help me clarify this. When you went out on May	Ì	
21	phone or I did something after. I don't exactly remember.	21	retire and I was putting my application in.

DEPOSITION OF THOMAS M. KELLEY ON OUNTE I Page 14 of 21 Page 51 repercussions or allegations of sick leave abuse? 1 (Whereupon, the letter Absolutely not. Emphatically not. 2 2 dated September 9, 2003, 3 All right, I'm just asking. ٦ was marked as Exhibit No. I never questioned -- I never received that 4 11 for the defendarat.) 5 lætter that you have in there ever till the production of 5 MR. GALLITANO: Can we go off the record for a 6 documents. б mipute? 7 ο. I'm not asking you if -- I'm asking you if you 7 MR. SILVERFINE: Absolutely. 8 8 (Discussion off the record.) 9 Well, I consider it a personal insult from that 9 BY MR. SILVERFINE department and that individual to say those things after 10 10 Just showing you Exhibit 11, just help me on ο. the event that I went through. 11 this, if you would. The first paragraph says: (Reading) 11 Q. All right, I'm just asking you if you said 12 12 Please be advised that on September 8, 2003, the something. Do you understand the question? 13 13 Commission of the Division of Public Employee Ret irement A. I understand the question. I never made that 14 14 Administration granted accidental disability (end 15 remark to him. 15 reading). 16 Q. That's what I'm asking. 16 Do you see that? 17 Okav. 17 Α. Uh-huh. 18 And just so I'm clear, you did, however, change ο. 18 ο. You have to say for the record -in Exhibit 10 your request for vacation time be changed 19 19 Δ Oh, yes. I'm sorry. 20 to sick time, and then ultimately you put in your 20 This letter was written on September 9. 21 retirement application, right? 21 this a particularly quick turnaround in your experience? 22 I put my retirement page in on the 25th, as it 22 states, okay, and after when I put my retirement in, it's 23 Why was this letter sent the next day, if you 0. always been the policy of the town to use accrued sick 24 24 know? Page 50 Page 52 1 time for this type of retirement application till the 1 All I can figure is, number one, when you have medical panel comes back with the appropriate language, 2 2 a -- I mean, I had a unanimous medical panel in my case. 3 okay, because of a court decision in Brookline that they I had three cardiologists indicate that it was -- four 3 could wait for a 111F. There have been numerous questions on the certificate were answered in the decisions in the court that say that's perfectly legal 5 5 affirmative. I was on the job when it happened. 6 for the town but then IOD is retroactively given as a 6 were no questions from the board. The board sent it up result of the medical panel's decision, and that's been 7 7 to the state. The state looks at it. Their final under in statute law as well as case law. 8 -- they're required to look at it under Chapter 32. They 9 Let's move on for a moment to the next 9 make the final determination if there are any 10 document, if we can. I'm going to show you another piece inadequacies, address any issues. They can remand it 10 of paper which is dated September 9, 2003, and I believe 11 11 back to the board. They look at it, and then they just 12 it's cc'd to you. 12 say okay. 13 (Hands to witness.) 13 And were you treated any differently than any 14 Α. Yeah. 14 other retiree to your knowledge? 15 0. Do you recognize this? 15 No, I precluded myself entirely from the 16 Α. Absolutely. 16 procedure just so that that allegation that you just 17 And this is a letter that Debra Sullivan, the 17 stated would not be relevant. director of the Town of Plymouth's Contributory 18 18 Let's show you another document which is -- I 19 Retirement Board, sent to the chief of police? 19 think you just referenced. Yeah, this is a standard letter sent by the 20 20 MR. SILVERFINE: And it's been previously 21 retirement board to the employer department head. It is marked as Exhibit 3 in the Attorney Sacco 21 22 required -- that letter is required by CMR under Chapter 22 deposition, but we'll mark it as Exhibit No. 12. 23 23 (Whereupon, the findings 24 MR. SILVERFINE: Let's mark this as Exhibit 11, of fact were marked as LINDA M. CORCORAN, CVR - (781) 585-8172

Page 53 Page 55 1 Exhibit No. 12 for the 1 take a physical? 2 defendant.) 2 A: No. You asked that question before. 3 MR. GALLITANO: Revisiting. 3 Just bear with me. 4 MR. SILVERFINE: What's that? 4 Δ Okav. 5 THE WITNESS: We already went over this. 5 Q. And was there any evidence of hypertension or 6 MR. GALLITANO: I think this is an old ground. 6 heart disease once you began your employment with the 7 THE WITNESS: We went over this. 7 Town of Plymouth that you notified the town about? 8 MR. SILVERFINE: I need to just ask a few 8 A. None. 9 questions. 9 ο. Put that down. 10 MR. GALLITANO: Last time we went all through 10 I just didn't know if you wanted to read the 11 this, though. 11 rest of it. That's all. Part D is pretty pertinent. 12 MR. SILVERFINE: But I'm not going to be that 12 No, no. These guys are just making fun of me 13 long. You'll forgive me. I'm just trying to be 13 for asking follow-up questions. 14 thorough. I'm not looking to bang him up more. 14 Yeah, yeah. 15 THE WITNESS: You're not banging me up, believe 15 As long as you want me to ask a question, on 16 me. 16 Exhibit 12, just so I understand -- and just help me on 17 BY MR. SILVERFINE 17 this -- Paragraph 12, when it says the board conducted an 18 Showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 11 --18 evidentiary hearing, is that the same board that you 19 MR. GALLITANO: 12. 19 serve on? 20 MR. SILVERFINE: Is it 12? 20 Α. I precluded myself from that. I wasn't a part 21 MR. GALLITANO: It's 12. 21 of that decision. 22 MR. SILVERFINE: Sorry, I don't have my glasses 22 0. I'm just asking if it was the same board. 23 on. Thank you. 23 Α. Yes, it was the same board. 24 ο. -- Exhibit 12 -- and if I asked you this 24 The same individuals who sit on the board with Page 54 Page 56 1 already, forgive me, but in Section 5 where it says 1 you, right? "Findings of Fact," the first day on July -- paragraph 2 2 Yes, the Town of Plymouth -- as a member of the 3 numbered 5 on July 29, 2003, do you see that? 3 Town of Plymouth's retirement system, my application must 4 (Hands to witness.) 4 be submitted by statute to the Town of Plymouth 5 Yes. Α. 5 Retirement Board. I cannot submit it to anybody else by 6 To your knowledge, did they review your entire 6 the town. There are specific regulations in the medical and nonmedical history or just as it related to 7 procedures in the CMRs that indicate if a board member is R the May 25, 2003, incident? 8 in front of them for these type of reasons, they preclude q A. As part of the application to retire, which I 9 themselves from it, and those procedures were followed to 10 believe Debra explained that to you yesterday -- the 10 the T on advice of counsel. 11 other day -- Debra Sullivan, you are required in the 11 And you're the director of the board? Is that Q. 12 application, which is quite extensive, to name all the 12 the right term? 13 doctors that you've had and all your medical conditions 13 Α. I am the chairman. 14 prior to this incident on the date of application. Okay, 14 The chairman, okay. How long had you --15 all those facts are given, reviewed by the board, the 15 Α. I wasn't the chairman at this time. board's attorney. Then a medical panel gets the exact 16 16 Dello Russo was. 17 same stuff. They review it as well as the incident 17 0. Back in 2003? 18 involved and answer the four questions on the 18 No, Dello Russo was. certificate, which they did in my case in the 19 19 What years did you serve as chairman? 0. 20 affirmative, all four questions. 20 When he left. He left right after that. I 21 Now, right below that in Section A it says you 21 think in August, September. 22 passed a preemployment physical. Do you see that? 22 ο. And you served as chairman ever since? 23 Α. Yes, I did. Α. Yes, I have. Did you have to at any time subsequent to that 24 24 Q. We had talked a few minutes ago about the

Case 1:05-cv-10596-MBB Document 3 M. KELLEY 0 VOLUME II Page 16 of 21

vacation/sick time that you had changed after you had gone out with your heart injury on May 25, 2003. Okay, remember that?

- A. We talked about it, yes.
- Q. Did you also send the captain an e-mail on -- MR. SILVERFINE: Strike that. Strike that whole line of questioning.
- Q. Prior to this injury, had you raised the issue during your employ both at the retirement board and a police officer trying to persuade the town to adopt a policy that if an employee used sick time while waiting for the "Heart Law" retirement and the retirement was approved, that the town would retroactively restore the employee's sick time?
- A. I'm going to explain the statute now. I believe I answered this earlier in the deposition. I can actually point to the page. It's in there.
 - Q. Okay.

A. What happens is there was a decision in 1987, Brookline versus — a Brookline decision. I don't know the exact officer's name. Blair, Blair. Brookline versus Sergeant Blair. In that case what they said is that there was not an automatic triggering of 111F benefits when it comes to issues around the heart bill.

was something that we did as five individuals trying to be decent because the town's policy was there were people who would use up accrued sick time and run out. And I had firefighters and police/firefighters come to me and say, "Kelley, I'm losing my house as well as losing my job because I ran out of sick time and I haven't got an answer from the state yet on the medical panels."

Page 59

Page 60

And the medical panel would come back —— and I haven't had one rejected —— where it was job related, and they retroactively would back pay them all their accrued sick time and monies from the day that they filed application or the date of the event. We were trying to show Mrs. Beth how they were hurting police and firefighters and that simply by adopting a change till there was contrary evidence that you wouldn't be penalizing guys for risking their lives, and they took no interest in it.

- Q. How long had you attempted to push this?
- A. I didn't push anything. We just tried to point it out in a matter of exchanging ideas from employer to a retirement board that is faced with the problem that the employer is hurting its own employees, and they just didn't want to recognize what they were doing in their

Page 58

At any point in time in an injury, the department head -- in this case the police chief or the town manager can issue someone 111F benefits. It's at their prerogative. But in a heart application, what happens is this. And specifically there's a procedure. The board -- if you were sent to a panel, there was only so many heart physicians and panels in the state. So we were tracking the time it takes for an individual that has an event, turns around and files an application, and by the time you get all the paperwork together and he gets in front of a medical panel because there might be a backlog or where he lives and all that and getting people, a panel to sit down in scheduling, we found as a board a number of years it was taking 120 days. And what was happening is that individuals were using up accrued benefits and then running out of them. If they didn't have enough sick time to cover 120 days, they would go without a paycheck. Now, some communities in an effort not to financially destroy their police and firefighters have adopted a policy to say if there's an application in front of a board and the person uses up accrued time and they're going to go without a paycheck, they have a certain amount of -- the town will give them 111F till the medical panel comes back with a contrary evidence or

practice.

Q. How long did you attempt to discuss this with the town?

A. Oh, we discussed it a number of times over the years. I don't know how many times.

Q. About how many?

A. I couldn't put a number on it. Five or six. I had cases.

Q. You mean five or six years did you talk about it?

A. No, I had cases. And I would show them -- we have a case right now. I had a number of cases tracked by the administrators to say, "This is the date it started, and this is the date we finally adjudicated." On average it was 121 days.

Q. Back in September of 2003, do you remember who later counsel for the town was, by any chance?

A. I don't know. It could have been Hesse, Toomey & Lehane. It could have been what's his name there.

Harold Kowal. I think it might have -- I don't know. I don't know. They use different ones for different people. Then they use Kopelman and Paige for different things too.

Q. Were you aware at the time back in September of

Page 6

2003 at least when you were putting in for this that labor counsel recommended the town not adopt this policy that you're referring to? Are you aware of that?

A. I was aware that they spoke in on it. And what was kind of interesting because I believe the department head at the time said there was a financial -- it was the end of the world, and the financial director said, "Where is it the end of the world? We're going to retroactively pay these people back anyway."

So I didn't see anything in labor counsel recommending anything.

Q. Let me show you another letter which is dated January 14, 2004. Do you recognize that?

A. Yes, I do.

- Q. And that's a letter to you from Paul Boyle, the president of --
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. -- the Plymouth Brotherhood?

(Hands to witness.)

- A. Uh-huh.
- Q. Dated January 14, 2004?
 - A. Yes, it is.

MR. SILVERFINE: Let's mark this as Exhibit 13.

(Whereupon, the letter

Page 62

dated January 14, 2004, was marked as Exhibit No. 13 for the defendant,)

BY MR, SILVERFINE

- Q. Showing you now what's been marked as 13, did you have conversations with Paul Boyle, the Brotherhood president prior to him going in to speak to Chief Pomeroy relative to your injury-on-duty loss compensation?
- A. Right, what I do is after -- after I got everything back from the state and it was approved, I had all the documentation from the medical panel, all the documentation from the retirement board. The certificate, which is evidenced from the doctors' panel, unanimous. I gave those to Dana Goodwin, okay, and Rooney, and I asked them to look at these, sit down with the chief and explain -- and show him what I had for evidence. I documented everything that we are required to do for injury-on-duty status and would he reconsider his claim.
- $\ensuremath{\text{Q}}.$ And did Mr. Goodwin talk to you after he talked to the chief?
- A. I spoke to him on the phone, and he also gave me an e-mail of a conversation that Larry Rooney had with the chief indicating the chief said, "I disagree with the

medical panel. I'm not paying him." We had that evidence. I believe that's in the documents we produced to you as well.

- Q. Was there some discussion about the fact that -- with Officer Goodwin that you had never provided the information requested by the chief earlier as to certain medical records --
 - A. Prior -- excuse me. I'm sorry. Go ahead.
- Q. -- that he had asked from you back when you first were submitting this stuff?
- A. When we first had it, I had the preliminary stuff, which I believe I showed you before the last time we were speaking. I only had those two things. I mean, part of the injury-on-duty statute clearly says on a specific date and time an individual suffers an injury. Well, let's take the facts in front of us. I was at a mandated training program. 111F says you must be on duty. Well, I was on duty. There's no argument there. If anybody thinks I wasn't, then the chairman's a liar and everybody else is a liar. I collapsed onto Mr. Chandler. He and two other officers dragged me out. I must have been faking then because they dragged me out unconscious. I was taken there to the hospital.

I'm trying to explain something to you.

Page 64

- Q. No, no. I'm just trying to ask you a question. Nobody here is disputing --
 - A. Let me finish then.
 - Q. Fine, okay.

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{MR}}.$ GALLITANO: Wait a minute. Let's go off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

MR. SILVERFINE: Back on the record.

BY MR. SILVERFINE

- Q. My question -- and if you don't understand my question, please let me know. Just my question -- and if you don't understand, I'll rephrase it. My question is, when you talked to Dana Goodwin sometime in October of 2003, did he say to you words to the effect "The chief asked for some supplemental records, medical records, which he says he never got"?
- A. That's not incorrect (sic). Dana never said that. What I did is that when I got my information and he went into that meeting and Rooney went into that meeting in November in there, he had all the records that you just produced in front of us. He had and the certificate from the hospital and the certificate from the medical panel. He had all those records to make his determination.

DEPOSITION OF THOMAS M. KELLEY DYOLUME II Page 18 of 21 1 All right, let me just follow up. So Goodwin 1 and I gave Larry Rooney in his hand all the documents 2 did not tell you "The chief says you didn't supplement 2 that I just spoke to. He had those documents in his 3 the earlier records," which we indicated through your 3 possession given to him by Larry Rooney on this date and 4 deposition Exhibits 3 and 4 that he never received 4 that date. 5 supplementation on the medical records you initially 5 Ω. And how do you know that? 6 provided? 6 Because they told me they did it. Α. 7 A. That's not correct. He did. Larry Rooney gave 7 ο. So are you saying --8 it to him, and he had those in his possession. I gave 8 Larry Rooney told me he gave the documents to 9 them to Larry Rooney prior to his meeting with the chief. q him because I spoke to him on the phone. He called me 10 But my question was, did Dana Goodwin come back 10 after the meeting, and he said, "The chief said -- " -- I 11 to you --11 told him, "Did you give him all those documents I gave 12 Α. He never said that to me, no. 12 you?" He said, "Yes, I did," and Larry Rooney told me 13 -- and say, "The chief says he never got 13 emphatically the chief said, "I'm not paying him because 14 supplementation"? 14 I disagree with the medical panel." 15 No. No, he didn't. 15 And do you recall when the conversation you had 16 Did you yourself outside of Goodwin, Rooney 16 with Rooney which you've just related took place? 17 ever send to the chief supplementation of Exhibits 3 and 17 It was probably about 5:30 in the afternoon. 18 4 that we've already marked and talked about? 18 ο. What date? 19 What I did is, when I got my paperwork back, I 19 Oh, I don't remember exactly the date. It was spoke to Larry Rooney at the station. I gave him a copy 20 20 in the fall sometime. 21 of everything and requested him to go up to the chief. 21 ο. The fall of 2003? 22 The chief also, as the employer, has a complete copy or 22 Α. Yes. 23 has access at the town hall to my personnel file, a 23 Q. In the fall of 2003, November 25, 2003, did you 24 complete copy of my personnel file, which would have the come into the police station and have a conversation with 24 Page 66 Page 68 1 same documentation that I have that I gave to Larry 1 Captain Botieri where you gave him this package of 2 Rooney. He would have had access to the day I retired, material and said, "Give this to the chief if he wants to 2 3 and it was certified because all that information is 3 stay out of superior court"? given to them, hand-delivered up there. 4 Α. Never did. Never did. That's a bonafide lie, 5 Q. Who does that, do you know? 5 L-I-E. The administrators, the town -- Mrs. Flynn, Sue б 0. Just bear with me for a second. 7 Turner when they were there. That letter that you showed 7 Okay, I agree. Go ahead. I'm bearing with Α. me earlier is a notification, and all records are 8 8 you. exchanged back and forth from personnel. 9 Did you say that to anyone else on the police 10 So let me stop you right here. We talked about 10 department or the town? this last time, Exhibit 5, which was a letter back in --11 The only time I went into the station is IΑ. June of 2003. 12 spoke to Larry Rooney because he was the assistant Okay, just bear with me. 13 prosecutor. I called him. I met him at the station. I And he had requested -- "he," meaning the chief 14 went in there at the end of the day. I believe it was -- additional documentation. Is there any other 15 like 3:30 for him. He was up from court. I gave him all additional documentation that you say you submitted 1.6 the documentation because he was scheduled to sit down besides Exhibits 3 and 4 other than the application for 17 with the chief and have a meeting and discuss my issue. retirement that was approved in early September? Do you 18 I never spoke to Captain Botieri. see what I'm saying? 19 Did you speak to anyone else and say something Okay, these documents here I gave him on a 20 like that --

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

preliminary level. I would not have had the other

documents which I gave to him before the request was

made, as you see in Exhibit 13, on this date. On this

date and on this date, the chief had the entire package,

21

22

Α.

Q.

Α.

No. I didn't.

-- similar back in November of 2003?

Whether it be Chief Pomeroy or anyone else?

Case 1:05-cv-1069081600 OFCPHOMAS IN KELLECY 10/20/2010 II Page 19 of 21

	Case 1.00-cv- IDDP PO GIPTON OF CPHON	-	
1	Page 69 A. No.	:	Page 71
2	Q. A secretary? Anyone?	1 2	of Plymouth?
3	A. (Shakes head.)	3	A. I wanted it for my files.
4	Q. You just have to answer for the record.	4	Q. And when had you requested this, if you recall?
5	A. No, never did.	5	A. I don't remember the date when I requested it.
- 6	Q. Did you ever in your position as chairman of	6	Q. What is your relationship with Debra Sullivan?
7	the retirement board threaten to halt someone's	7	A. She's been the administrator and works there
8	retirement process because of your position on the	8	for the ten years I've been on the board.
9	retirement board?	9	Q. Were you the boss of Ms. Sullivan under the A. The board is the boss. The chairman just
10	A. Absolutely not.	10	in the state of th
11	Q. And did that include Captain Botieri?	111	facilitates some of the day-to-day operations, but all
12	A. Absolutely never made that statement to Captain	12	decisions are brought back to the board. Q. You have no direction over Ms. Sullivan?
13	Botieri,	13	
14	Q. Now, prior to May 25, 2003, had you been	14	, and sould do a mote.
15	suffering from tension and stress and being medically	15	Q. But you as a member of the board also do? A. Yes.
16	treated for it?	16	Q. And how long have you directed Ms. Sullivan?
17	A. No, I wasn't.	17	Is that since you've been on the board itself or since
18	Q. Were you suffering from any physical or	18	you've been as director chairman?
19	emotional distress or stress since December 2002?	19	A. I've been on the board for ten years, and I've
20	A. I was on like I said, I indicated with the	20	worked with her.
21	doctors' notes that I gave them in the spring of 2003	21	Q. For those ten years?
22	I was under the care for Meniere's disease as well as	22	A. Yes, right.
23	Lyme disease.	23	Q. Let's go to the next letter.
24	Q. Were you under care with a Dr. Moore prior to	24	MR. SILVERFINE: We'll mark this Exhibit 15.
		 	
1	Page 70 December May 25, 2003, for stress?		Page 72
2	A. No.	2	(Whereupon, a letter dated
3	Q. Let me show you another page.	3	May 26, 2004, was marked as
4	MR. SILVERFINE: And let's mark this Exhibit	4	Exhibit No. 15 for the
5	14.	5	defendant.) BY MR. SILVERFINE
6	(Whereupon, a letter dated	6	Q. Showing you what's been marked Exhibit 15, do
7	January 29, 2004, was	7	you recognize that?
8	marked as Exhibit No. 14	8	(Hands to witness.)
9	for the defendant.)	9	A. I recognize that.
10	BY MR. SILVERFINE	10	Q. Okay, I think this was referred earlier today
11	Q. I ask you if you recognize that letter, Mr.	11	as a three-page letter, but you'll agree with me it's a
12	Kelley.	12	two-page letter from Michael Botieri?
13	(Hands to witness.)	13	A. Uh-huh.
14	A. Yes, I remember this letter. Yes.	14	Q. You have to answer for the record.
			i
1.5	Q. What's been marked as Exhibit 14, why did you	15	A. Yes. Yes, yes.
16		15 16	A. Yes. Yes, yes. Q. And this is dated May 26, 2004?
16 17	Q. What's been marked as Exhibit 14, why did you request this letter? It says in the first paragraph at your request.		, ,
16 17 18	Q. What's been marked as Exhibit 14, why did you request this letter? It says in the first paragraph at your request. A. I just wanted documentation of what had	16	Q. And this is dated May 26, 2004?
16 17 18 19	Q. What's been marked as Exhibit 14, why did you request this letter? It says in the first paragraph at your request. A. I just wanted documentation of what had transpired in the on the board.	16 17	Q. And this is dated May 26, 2004? A. Uh-huh, yes.
16 17 18 19 20	Q. What's been marked as Exhibit 14, why did you request this letter? It says in the first paragraph at your request. A. I just wanted documentation of what had transpired in the on the board. Q. Were you already looking to file suit in this	16 17 18	Q. And this is dated May 26, 2004? A. Uh-huh, yes. Q. Did you, in fact, have an interaction with
16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. What's been marked as Exhibit 14, why did you request this letter? It says in the first paragraph at your request. A. I just wanted documentation of what had transpired in the on the board. Q. Were you already looking to file suit in this action as of January 29, 2004?	16 17 18 19	O. And this is dated May 26, 2004? A. Uh-huh, yes. O. Did you, in fact, have an interaction with Michael Botieri on May 22, 2004?
16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. What's been marked as Exhibit 14, why did you request this letter? It says in the first paragraph at your request. A. I just wanted documentation of what had transpired in the on the board. Q. Were you already looking to file suit in this action as of January 29, 2004? A. No.	16 17 18 19 20	Q. And this is dated May 26, 2004? A. Uh-huh, yes. Q. Did you, in fact, have an interaction with Michael Botieri on May 22, 2004? A. May 26. May 26 was the retirement meeting I
16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. What's been marked as Exhibit 14, why did you request this letter? It says in the first paragraph at your request. A. I just wanted documentation of what had transpired in the on the board. Q. Were you already looking to file suit in this action as of January 29, 2004?	16 17 18 19 20 21	O. And this is dated May 26, 2004? A. Uh-huh, yes. O. Did you, in fact, have an interaction with Michael Botieri on May 22, 2004? A. May 26. May 26 was the retirement meeting I mean, retirement party at the Pinehills.

[,	Page 73		. KELLEY DY PAGE 11 Page 20 of 21
1:	happened between you and Michael Botieri on you said	1	A. Yes, I never discussed it.
2	May 26, 2004.	2	Q. So just follow along with me, and if the answe
3	A. Well, it's on the date of the letter.	3	is
4	Q. I'm sorry. It's	4	A. Okay.
5	A. Oh, yeah, the 22nd. You're right. Forgive me.	5	Q. Whatever it is, just tell me. I'm not assuming
6	You're right. You're right, I was just looking at the	6	anything. I need your answers.
7	letter here. I thought you were saying the letter date,	7	A. Okay, I never discussed it.
8	okay.	8	Q. So my question is, whether it be this night or
9	At the end of the night, I was leaving with my	9	any prior incident, had you had any discussion with Mr.
10	wife and Bobby Hicks, and Chuckie Warnock called me over	10	Botieri relative to some opposition in an election you
11	and said from a distance he said Captain Botieri	11	were facing at that time?
12	wanted to speak to me. So I said in jest, "Oh, Mike	12	A. Never.
13	wants to speak to little old me." I said, "Okay," and I	13	Q. Were you running for retirement board again at
14	walked over with that, and he turned around, and he told	14	that time?
15	me to go fuck myself.	15	A. That was a reelection year. Yes, it was.
16	Q. I'm sorry. Who did?	16	Q. And when was the election coming up?
17	A. Mike Botieri.	17	A. I don't know if it was the end of the month or
18	Q. That's the first thing he said?	18	something like that. Maybe it might have been the end of
.9	A. The first thing he said. He turned around and	19	June or beginning of maybe the middle of June
20	told me to go fuck myself.	20	sometime.
21	Q. Okay, what happened next?	21	Q. And who was your opposition running for one of
22	A. I told him I said, "No, Mike, you go fuck	22	the seats, if you remember?
23	yourself." And at that point he had a coffee cup in his	23	A. I believe it was the chief's secretary, Lynn
24	hand, and he had a little coffee in it. And he was ready	24	Fortini.
	Page 74		Page 76
2	to throw it in my face, and Officer Warnock stopped him	1	Q. And what was your relationship with Lynn
	from doing that. And then I left. My wife, myself, and	2	Fortini?
3	Bobby Hicks, we left the place.	3	A. I had no problem with Lynn.
4	Q. Prior to you say him saying those words to you,	4	Q. And she was directly contesting your seat
5	had you said or done anything to him?	5	against you?
6	A. Nothing. Never spoke to him the whole night	6	A. No, she was contesting there were two seats,
7	before. I hadn't spoke to him in months.	7	and she was contesting one of the two seats.
8	Q. Had he approached you and extended his hand to	8	Q. Who else was running for that seat?
9	shake your hand?	9	A. Mr. Manfredi.
0	A. No, he didn't.	10	Q. Mr. Manfredi is the same gentleman you
1	Q. Did you discuss with him your opposition in an	11	mentioned earlier today?
2	upcoming election?	12	A. Yes, yes.
3	A. No, I didn't. Not that night. I never did.	13	Q. Were you angry that you were facing opposition
4	Q. Never did?	14	in the election?
5	A. Never did.	15	A. I wasn't angry. I just from what I had
6	Q. You never discussed with Mr. Botieri any	16	heard because I was out of the station, that the chief
7	discussion relative to an election you were undergoing at	17	instructed her to run against me and Dick and that
3	that point?	18	Q. I'm sorry. Who's Dick?
	A. Didn't. I wasn't working. Remember, I was out	19	A. Dick Manfredi.
)	of the station. I was not working anymore.	20	Q. Okay.
L	Q. I understand.	21	A. And that basically I had heard through the
2	A. Well, I wasn't in the station to see him. I	22	grapevine of different individuals that the chief went
	was home. That's all.	23	around telling people to sign her papers and that she
Į.	Q. But you live in Plymouth?	24	went around telling people, "I'm not running against

Page 77 Page 79 1. those guys. There are five positions." the bus. In the next breath, he's his best boy, kissing 1 2 So she misrepresented herself to a lot of his fanny. 3 people, and a lot of people were angry with her for doing 3 Did you ever tell Mr. Viella words to the that because they didn't realize that the makeup of the 4 4 effect "I hope you don't need the retirement board's help 5 board is not just five members. It's only two elected 5 someday"? 6 from the membership. And they were angry that she did No, Steve has a -- Steve has a real problem of that. 7 telling the truth or telling, you know, in times --8 Did you have discussion with Mr. Botieri lacking in what they call intestinal fortitude. 8 9 relative to his signing Ms. Fortini's nomination papers 9 Did you ever say that to anyone? 10 10 A. To him? 11 A. No, I didn't. 11 ٥. To anyone. 12 Let me just finish. 12 No, everybody knows that. I didn't say that to 13 -- for a position on the Plymouth Retirement 13 him. I just left. 14 Board on that night? 14 Q. Try my -- I'm not trying to trick you. 15 Α. 15 No, I know you're not. I know you're not. 16 At any time did you have discussion with Mr. Q. 16 Just try my question. My question is, did you 17 Botieri about his signing nomination papers? 17 ever say that to any town employee, police officer, or 18 Α. No. 18 otherwise --19 ο. How about with anyone else that was involved in 19 20 the Town of Plymouth or the Plymouth Police Department? 20 -- words to the effect "I hope you don't need 21 Well, if you mention Viella here in the letter 21 the retirement board's -- " --22 here, I was down the town hall looking to check on my 22 Α. No. no. 23 nomination papers for town meeting member at the time to 23 Q. -- "-- help someday"? 24 see when I was up. And I ran into Steve, and I said, 24 I've got a volume of people that I've helped. Page 78 Page 80 1 "Jesus, I'm glad that you're supporting me" in all of the MR. GALLITANO: Excuse me. You've got to let things that I did for Steve, helping him out with 2 2 him finish the whole question -different retirement issues and different issues that he 3 3 THE WITNESS: Okay, okay. personally needed help with. And he -- you know, he MR. GALLITANO: -- so that you answer the 5 basically said, "The chief told me to sign it," and ${\tt I}$ 5 question completely. said, "Well, you're under one of the -- you're appointed 6 THE WITNESS: Okay. by the chief to the detective division, so if you don't 7 7 MR. SILVERFINE: And also so the stenographer sign it, I guess they throw you out on the street because you're not one of the boys." And I said, "Well, Steve, I 9 MR. GALLITANO: Right. I mean, you've cut him 10 thought you had -- I thought you were a little bit more 10 off --11 loyal than that to be intimidated to doing something like 11 THE WITNESS: Okay, well, I --12 that," but that's Mr. Viella. MR. GALLITANO: I'm trying to finish --12 13 Did you swear at Mr. Viella? 13 THE WITNESS: I know. I know. I appreciate 14 No, I didn't swear at him. I was in a public 14 it. I'm sorry. 15 building, and I left. 15 MR. SILVERFINE: Just off the record for one 16 Did Mr. Viella indicate he was signing Ms. 16 second. 17 Fortini's nomination papers? 17 (Discussion off the record.) 18 No, he had already done it. 18 MR. SILVERFINE: Back on the record. 19 ο. But it's fair to say you were angry and upset 19 BY MR. SILVERFINE 20 at him for --20 Did Officer Viella have to order you to leave 21 I wasn't angry and upset with him. I was 21 the polling place when he saw you on May 8, 2004? 22 disappointed at him and disappointed at his lack of --22 Α. how would you want to say it? -- credibility and lack of 23 23 Did anyone have to order you to leave the 24 -- you know, in one breath he's throwing the chief under 24 polling place on or about May 8, 2004?

EXHIBIT 4 B

	Case 1:05-cv-P5396\$WBN QFoTHQM	<i>-</i> 13/176	Page 2 of 15
•	Page 81		Page 8
1	A. No.	1	A. No.
2	Q. Relative to I think you mentioned his	2	Q. Any other police officer that night?
3	name earlier or somebody did mention his name	3	A. No.
4	Sergeant Michael Peddell, was he your supervisor at one	4	Q. Did you use any profanity as it related to Mr.
5	point?	5	Botieri to Mr. Botieri on the night of May 22, 2004?
6	A. Sometimes he was the day shift supervisor.	6	A. We both exchanged niceties.
7	Q. At one point in time, did he have to admonish	7	Q. So that's the words you told us earlier?
8	you on some issue?	8	A. Yes.
9	A. Never.	9	Q. Anything else that you recall saying to him?
10	Q. Did you ever tell him, "Sergeant Peddell, I	10	A. No.
11	hope you never have to come in front of the retirement	11	Q. I'm trying to move along here. I'm going to
12	board" or words to that effect?	12	show you another document.
13	A. Never did. If I had done anything that this	13	MR. SILVERFINE: We'll mark it. I believe
14	letter indicates, I would have had a reprimand or a	14	these are Plymouth Retirement Board executive
15	suspension in my file.	15	session minute meetings, and we'll mark this as
16	Q. Okay.	16	Exhibit 16.
17	A. Mike Peddell is in the same position, under the	17	(Whereupon, executive
18	thumb and the appointment of Botieri and Mr. Pomeroy.	18	session minutes were marked
19	His job and his duties, where he sits can be changed in a	19	as Exhibit No. 16 for the
20	minute.	20	defendant.)
21	Q. Did you ever make public statements before the	21	MR. GALLITANO: Can we go off the record for a
22	Insurance Advisory Committee meeting wherein you stated,	22	minute?
23	"We don't need a woman on the retirement board"?	23	MR. SILVERFINE: Go ahead.
24	A. Absolutely did not. I believe there's a record	24	(Discussion off the record.)
	Page 82		Page 84
1	and a letter there to Mr. Botieri from the chairman of	1	MR. SILVERFINE: The Plymouth Retirement Board
2	the Insurance Advisory Committee, Dale Webber, who	2	executive session I'll just identify it by date
3	clearly refutes that argument, who was present at a	3	presently May 27, 2004, it's Exhibit 16.
4	meeting, and that I believe you were that letter was	4	Counsel would like to note an objection, and then
5	given to Mr. Botieri, and I believe he has a copy of that	5	I'll come back.
6	in his possession. They checked the minutes of the	6	MR. GALLITANO: As counsel for the deponent,
7	meeting, and the minutes of the meeting, any of those are	7	Mr. Kelley, I'm objecting to any questioning
8	all taped.	8	regarding these minutes because they are executive
9	Q. Let me get back to the night of May 22, 2004,	9	session minutes from the retirement board upon which
.0	this retirement ceremony.	10	he is a member, and under the terms of his oath of
.1	Did you at all physically touch Mr. Botieri	11	office, he's not supposed to disclose anything
.2	during that night?	12	that's in executive session. This is an unsigned
.3	A. No, I didn't.	13	copy, undated copy of an executive session. There's
.4	Q. Did you grab him by his left arm?	14	been no presentation of any vote authorizing the
.5	A. I only spoke to him briefly at the end of the	15	release of these minutes. Therefore, we object to
6	night. Never said a word to him the whole night, never	16	any line of questioning relating thereto, and my
.7	went near him.	17	client is instructed not to respond to any questions
8	Q. Did you ever say to him, "I hope you never have	1.8	should they be posed.
9	a heart attack and come before the retirement board" or	19	MR. SILVERFINE: For the record, I'm going to
0	words to that effect?	20	reserve on this and both check on whether or not
1	A. As I previously stated, I never made that	21	there has been a release, to see if they are
2	statement.	22	released. That's one. And two, based upon the
3	Q. Did you say that to anyone that night or any	23	subject matter of this particular case and
4	other night?	24	specifically the relevancy as based upon Mr.
-	·		SPECIAL COLLY THE TELEVANCY AS DASED UDOD MY

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

22

1 Kelley's claims, I may move to have this -- for the 2 defendants to be able to use this. So I'm going to 3 reserve on this at the end of this deposition, but we'll move on for the moment. All right, let's move on and mark this as the 6 next exhibit, No. 17. (Whereupon, a letter dated 8 June 1, 2004, was marked as 9 Exhibit No. 17 for the 10 defendant \

BY MR. SILVERFINE

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- I'm showing you that. Do you recognize that? (Hands to witness.)
- Α. Yes, I do.
- Fair to say this was a letter from Debra Sullivan, the director of the retirement board, to Captain Botieri, cc'd to the retirement board of which you were a member back on June 1, 2004?
 - Yes, it is.
- And this related to a complaint that he had filed as it related to you?
- That previous letter that we discussed, Exhibit -- I don't know if it's 13 or -- one of them was.
 - Relative to acknowledging the complaint -- and

Page 86

- we'll get to it in a minute -- what is your understanding of what, if anything, the retirement board once they received the complaint as we've now marked as Exhibit 15?
- A. The complaint was an issue that was nonboard business. It was a personal exchange of words, and Mr. Botieri took the opportunity to trump it up to make it more than it ever was.
- Q. Is it fair to say, at least from the allegations that Mr. Botieri made, they may have related to the board because of his allegation that you were going to somehow influence any retirement decision that may be made on his application?
- A. Well, I look at in the respect of if I $\operatorname{\mathsf{I}}$ in Exhibit 13 there you state that he states that I assaulted him -- I believe he said that this morning -and I grabbed him. If I had assaulted a captain of the police department, I can assure you he would have taken out complaints against me. And with that, that's the credibility I give his -- this issue.
- Let me ask you this. Relative to the retirement board, did they undertake any investigation as to the allegation as Captain Botieri described in Exhibit 15?
 - MR. GALLITANO: Objection. I'm also going to

advise my client that considering his position on the board, he should really -- before he answers that, he should have advice of the retirement board counsel as to whether he would be disclosing something, again, that would be part of an executive session.

MR. SILVERFINE: Well, I think I hear your objection, but I believe -- I believe there is public information that indicates that -- and we can get to it in a minute.

MR. GALLITANO: Well, there may be indications that there was an investigation. What I'm saying is you're asking him what the outcome of that investigation is.

MR. SILVERFINE: No, no. I asked him if they undertook an investigation. That's my first question.

BY MR. SILVERFINE

- My first question is, do you know whether or not an investigation was undertaken?
- The issue that you're addressing is an executive session issue, number one. Number two, I have very severe reservations on the fact of how you lawfully got that information. That information is in our

lockbox. There is a procedure for people to get it. And how you got a copy of that and place it in evidence lawfully is that, but I'm not going to speak to an executive session minutes or the surrounding issue other than the fact an executive session was issued on the unit on that issue.

MR. GALLITANO: But in answer to his question of whether an investigation took place and you --

The board looked into the matter.

MR. GALLITANO: You can answer the question, is what I'm saying.

Did you participate in the matter that was brought before the board?

lawsuit. So I'm going to reserve on that.

I'm not going to speak to executive session. MR. SILVERFINE: Okay, I'm going to reserve on all these because -- I'm reserving on these. Any question relative to what the retirement board did or did not do as to certain allegations that Captain Botieri brought I believe directly related to this

MR. GALLITANO: And for the record, I request that you give notice to counsel for the retirement board regarding that so they may be present at any -- if it goes to a motion before the superior court.

I INDA M CODCODAN CVD .. (794) ESE 9179

LINDA M. CORCORAN, CVR - (781) 585-8172

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Page 93

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF DEPONENT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

C.A. 1:05-cv-10596-NMG

I, <u>Thomas M. Kelley</u>, do hereby acknowledge that I have read and examined pages 1 through 92, inclusive, of the transcript of my deposition, as taken in Plymouth, Massachusetts, on Wednesday, June 21, 2006, and that:

the same is a true, correct, and complete transcription of the answers given by me to the questions therein recorded.

except for the changes noted in the attached errata sheet, the same is a true, correct, and complete transcription of the answers given by me to the questions therein recorded.

	Signat	ure

CERTIFICATE

Page 95

PLYMOUTH, SS

I, <u>Linda M. Corcoran</u>, a Court Reporter and Notary Public, in and for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do hereby certify that:

Thomas M. Kelley, having been satisfactorily identified and having been duly sworn by me to testify upon his oath, did so testify, and that this transcript is a full, true, and accurate record to the best of my knowledge, skill, and ability of the testimony taken at the Law Offices of Joseph R. Gallitano & Associates, 34 Main Street Extension, Suite 202, Plymouth, Massachusetts, on Wednesday, June 21, 2006, commencing at 2:07 p.m.

I further certify that I am a disinterested person to the action in which this deposition is taken.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and notarial seal this 31st day of July, 2006.

Linda M. Corcoran - Court Reporter My commission expires: October 6, 2006

Page 94

ERRATA	SHEET

Page: Should Read	Line:	Reads:
Page:	Line:	Reads:
Page: Should Read	Line:	Reads:
Page:	Line:	Reads:

KELLEY.WPD

		E1.WFD	
Word Page:Line	Word Page:Line	Word Page:Line	Word Page:Line
1:05-cv-10596-nmg(2) 1:6 93:6	a.the(11) 36:18 42:17 66:6 68:11 71:9	adoption(1) 20:15	Word Page:Line answer(15) 6:11 12:22 13:22 14:20
20-year(1) 21:21	73:19 86:4 87:21 88:9 91:4 91:10	advice(2) 56:10 87:3	15:1 16:15 43:15 54:18 59:8 69:4
5-inch(1) 29:7 9-month(1) 23:21	g thora(4) 28:22 26.0 26.12 44.1	advise(2) 87:1 90:18	72:14 75:2 80:4 88:7 88:10
a.(shakes(1) 69:3	a.there(4) 28:23 36:8 36:13 44:1 a.they(3) 26:14 27:12 89:11	advised(1) 51:12	,
a.absolutely(7) 27:20 31:1 49:2 50:16	a.this(1) 22:14	advisory(2) 81:22 82:2	answered(5) 11:8 12:11 17:15 52:4
69:10 69:12 81:24	a.to(2) 25:11 79:10	advocacy(1) 40:12	57:16
	a.uh-huh(6) 40:6 47:10 51:17 61:20	affect(2) 32:1 42:1 affirmative(2) 52:5 54:20	answers(6) 6:6 6:10 75:6 87:2 93:13
a.according(1) 24:10	72:13 72:17	affirms(1) 59:1	93:18
[a.again(1) 32:5	(-)	a contract to	2
a.all(2) 48:10 52:1 a.and(2) 76:21 91:15	a.we(7) 23:1 26:8 31:4 37:17 57:4 83: 89:15	⁰ 46:20 49:10 49:23 56:20 57:1 62:9	any(38) 5:2 5:15 5:22 7:8 7:8 7:10
a.another(1) 26:18	69.13	62:9 62:20 67:10 91:13	7:24 8:1 9:21 10:19 10:22 12:16 12:19
a.anybody(1) 27:22	a.well(6) 43:20 49:9 73:3 74:22 77:21		14:22 16:12 16:12 16:18 16:20 16:21 17:3 24:6 24:7 25:8 25:9 26:11 26:22
a.as(2) 54:9 82:21	86:13	afternoon(4) 4:16 4:19 4:21 67:17	27:16 29:5 30:22 36:17 44:12 44:19
a.because(1) 67:6		again(5) 5:2 6:8 14:20 75:13 87:5 against(7) 30:22 40:22 42:8 76:5 76:1	_ 52:9 52:10 52:13 52:13 54:24 55:5
a.dick(1) 76:19	a.what(3) 38:16 57:19 65:19	76:24 86:18	⁷ 58:1 60:17 66:15 69:18 74:16 75:9
a.didn't(1) 74:19	a.when(3) 22:6 56:20 63:11	70.21 00.10	75:9 77:16 79:17 82:7 82:23 83:4 84:
a.govoni(1) 38:7	a.which(1) 23:20	age(1) 21:3	84:14 84:16 84:17 86:11 86:21 88:16 88:23
a.he(1) 65:12	a.yeah(8) 25:5 39:15 40:8 44:16 50:14 50:20 55:14 91:23	agency(1) 41:4	anybody(5) 8:3 21:13 26:4 56:5 63:19
a.i(52) 19:18 22:19 24:1 26:24 28:11	30.20 33.14 31.23	agenda(1) 42:4	anymore(1) 74:20
29:13 30:8 30:14 32:23 33:4 33:16 33:21 33:24 34:12 34:15 35:11 35:24	a.yes(25) 24:17 27:18 33:14 45:6 45:8	agendas(2) 40:23 40:24	anyone(14) 9:4 12:19 22:2 24:4 25:21
37:14 38:2 38:11 38:19 40:18 40:23	45:18 47:7 54:5 54:23 55:23 56:2	aggravate(1) 12:10	68:9 68:19 68:24 69:2 77:19 79:9
42:9 46:24 49:4 49:14 49:22 55:20	56:23 61:15 61:22 67:22 70:14 71:15	aggrieved(1) 41:9	79:11 80:23 82:23
56:13 56:15 59:20 60:7 60:18 61:4	71:22 72:15 75:1 76:12 83:8 85:14	ago(5) 28:7 34:12 42:21 43:2 56:24	
62:22 69:20 70:18 71:2 71:4 72:9	85:19 91:19	agree(3) 68:7 72:11 90:14 agreed(2) 4:2 92:4	anything(15) 5:20 14:13 16:22 27:6 28:14 47:21 59:20 61:10 61:11 74:5
73:22 75:17 75:23 76:3 76:15 78:21 82:15 89:6 90:13 90:19 90:22	a.you(1) 35:1	agreement(1) 20:6	75:6 81:13 84:11 86:2 89:11
02.13 09.0 90.13 90.19 90.22	abbott(1) 38:4	ahead(6) 19:15 32:16 38:17 63:8 68:7	00.2 69.11
a.i'm(2) 57:15 88:14	ability(1) 95:11	83:23	anyway(1) 61:9
a.i've(2) 71:19 79:24	able(8) 4:20 11:15 29:3 43:3 44:5		appeal(2) 41:10 41:16
a.if(3) 19:13 25:17 28:20	48:23 48:24 85:2	aid(1) 36:1	appeals(3) 41:3 41:11 41:13
a.in(1) 24:21	-h. (777) 0.5 to 1 to 2	all(53) 4:3 9:23 10:12 12:7 14:21	appears(1) 18:9
a.it(4) 28:5 31:9 37:3 67:17	about(37) 8:5 13:1 15:3 15:8 16:16 17:2 17:7 22:1 22:16 22:17 22:18	15:18 17:11 18:4 22:17 25:8 25:20 26:7 27:20 27:24 28:1 28:7 30:16	appellate(1) 41:16
a.it's(1) 91:7	22:19 23:3 24:19 27:5 28:15 29:4	31:17 36:21 36:22 37:3 37:4 37:12	applicable(2) 1:25 44:4
1.june(1) 66:12	34:24 38:14 40:19 42:7 44:12 45:23	38:16 40:13 40:24 41:22 42:1 53:10	application(14) 46:4 48:21 49:21 50:1 54:9 54:12 54:14 56:3 58:4 58:9 58:20
ı.just(1) 35:19 ı.kevin(1) 44:18	48:9 48:24 55:7 56:24 57:4 60:9 63:4	54:12 54:13 54:15 54:20 55:11 58:10	59:13 66:17 86:12
Llarry(1) 67:8	65:18 66:10 67:17 77:17 77:19 80:24	58:12 59:11 62:11 62:11 64:20 64:23	
may(1) 72:20	89:10	66:3 66:8 67:1 67:11 68:15 71:10 74:23 78:1 82:8 82:11 85:5 88:16	applications(1) 44:21
.mike(2) 73:17 81:17	absence(2) 29:11 30:12 absolutely(1) 51:7	7 1.25 70.1 02.0 02.11 85.5 86.10	apply(1) 4:24
.mr(1) 76:9	ahuga(2) 24:11 40:1	allegation(4) 52:16 86:10 86:22 89:3	appointed(1) 78:6
.never(6) 34:20 68:4 74:15 75:12 81:9	access(4) 24:5 45:20 65:23 66:2	allegations(4) 30:22 49:1 86:9 88:18	appointment(2) 47:22 81:18
81:13	accident(1) 27:23	allege(1) 17:12	appreciate(1) 80:13 approached(1) 74:8
.no(52) 5:24 22:3 22:22 24:5 25:22	accidental(1) 51:14	alleged(1) 12:8	appropriate(1) 50:2
5:24 26:5 29:3 29:6 34:3 34:22 35:4		almost(2) 28:6 32:11	approved(3) 57:13 62:10 66:18
5:17 36:6 36:11 43:11 43:13 44:22	1 2 1:25 E4:24 49:24 JO:15	alone(1) 35:19	approximately(1) 31:7
5:1 47:19 51:22 52:15 55:2 56:18		along(2) 75:2 83:11 already(10) 6:9 25:16 30:16 53:5 54:1	april(3) 10:15 14:3 14:3
0:11 65:15 68:21 68:23 69:1 69:5	accurate(2) 33:23 95:10	65:18 70:20 78:18 89:15 91:11	ar-15s(1) 15:20
9:17 70:2 70:22 71:13 74:10 74:13 6:6 77:11 77:15 77:18 78:14 78:18	acknowledge(1) 93-8		area(5) 6:22 9:12 10:14 10:15 27:2
	acknowledging(1) 85:24	also(14) 5:3 5:4 7:15 8:7 13:15 20:22	areas(3) 7:11 26:19 27:1
2:13 83:1 83:3 83:10	action(3) 40:21 70:21 95:17	22:1 25:7 57:5 62:22 65:22 71:14 80:7	argument(2) 63:18 82:3
	actions(1) 22:19	86:24	argumentative(1) 29:8 arm(1) 82:14
	active(2) 35:14 37:8	always(1) 40:24	armstrong(2) 2:12 26:1
nothing(1) 74:6	activities(1) 46:18	always(1) 49:24 ambiguous(1) 31:22	around(13) 9:12 10:15 22:11 22:13
	activity(1) /:14	ambulance(1) 36:3	29:17 34:8 39:18 57:24 58:9 73:14
3:5 79:19 90:10	actually (4) 6.24 42.13 40:1/ 5/:1/	amount(3) 13:24 31:24 58:23	73:19 76:23 76:24
okay(7) 23:22 41:7 49:17 66:20 68:7	######################################	anaheim(1) 33;19	
		anger(2) 27:17 30:10	arrested(1) 39:8
	addressing(1) 97.31		articulate(2) 31:19 31:21
	adjudicate(I) 43:4	76:13 76:15 77:3 77:6 78:19 78:21	ask(9) 34:13 38:14 45:3 47:17 53:8
prior(2) 10:4 63:8	adi-di-4-3(1) (0.14		55:15 64:1 70:11 86:20
right(5) 23:5 38:5 47:16 62:9 91:21	administration(2) 42:1 51:14	nniversary(1) 14:8	asked(9) 26:9 33:6 44:11 53:24 55:2
sne(1) 19:7	administrative(4) 41:3 41:7 41:11 41:12	annoyed(2) 29:13 30:14	62:15 63:9 64:15 87:15
1 1 (1) 1 - 10	administrator(5) 19:0 29:24 71:6	mother(0) 8:22 27:24 41:15 45:2	
SICK(1) 47:13	administrators(3) 42:3 60:13 66:6	(0.10 53-19 61-13 70-2 02-13	asking(12) 26:4 26:6 36:16 36:16 49:3
	admonish(1) 81:7	,	49:7 49:7 49:12 49:16 55:13 55:22
that(5) 22:11 40:10 72:23 75:15 85:22	adopt(2) 57:10 61:2		87:13 assaulted(2) 86:15 86:16
	adopted(1) 58:20 adopting(1) 59:15		assaulting(1) 39:9
<u>-</u>	raobring(1) 25:12		asset(2) 31:20 32:1
ge:1			08/04/06 46:03:33

08/01/06 16:23:33

Page: 1

MELLE 1.VVPU			
Word Page:Line	Word Page:Line	Word Page:Line	Word Page:Line
assigned(2) 26:18 37:21	believe(50) 12:23 13:4 13:16 14:6 15:	broad-based(1) 42:19	check(3) 21:5 77:22 84:20
assistant(1) 68:12	15:17 15:23 15:23 16:3 16:7 25:2	brody(1) 2:22	checked(1) 82:6
associates(3) 1:33 2:7 95:12	25:24 26:20 26:20 30:17 33:11 33:16	broke(1) 44:11	ehecks(2) 7:10 30:16
association(1) 40:11	34:5 34:5 34:12 35:11 35:12 36:8 38:15 46:15 47:13 47:14 47:23 48:12	brookline(4) 50:3 57:20 57:20 57:21	chief(48) 8:14 10:5 13:1 13:8 13:9
assuming(3) 47:1 47:3 75:5	50:11 53:15 54:10 57:16 61:5 63:2	brotherhood(2) 61:19 62:6	13:15 14:13 14:16 15:3 15:16 15:24
assure(1) 86:17 attached(1) 93:17	63:12 68:14 75:23 81:24 82:4 82:5	brought(11) 7:12 10:10 16:19 17:2	16:3 17:12 20:14 22:18 22:20 24:3
attack(2) 12:5 82:19	83:13 86:15 87:8 87:8 88:19 89:6	17:4 42:10 42:22 71:11 88:13 88:19	29:10 41:20 47:24 48:13 50:19 58:2
attempt(1) 60:2	90:19 91:16 91:19	89:4	62:7 62:16 62:21 62:24 62:24 63:6 64:14 65:2 65:9 65:13 65:17 65:21
attempted(1) 59:19		bruce(1) 9:5 budge(4) 7:4 28:12 33:5 39:2	65:22 66:14 66:24 67:10 67:13 68:2
attend(5) 31:8 32:4 32:6 40:16 42:6	below(1) 54:21	budge's(2) 45:19 45:19	68:17 68:24 76:16 76:22 78:5 78:7
attended(4) 32:13 32:21 33:18 33:24	benefit(1) 21:2	building(3) 8:9 8:10 78:15	78:24
attending(2) 40:4 47:21	benefits(10) 17:14 20:20 20:22 20:24 40:21 42:7 44:20 57:24 58:3 58:16	bus(1) 79:1	chief's(1) 75:23
attention(6) 7:9 7:12 20:9 21:15 30:5		business(2) 32:24 86:5	chris(1) 41:19
42:22	besides(5) 12:15 25:6 35:15 36:17 66:	bylaw(9) 19:22 20:4 20:13 20:14 20:16	chuckie(1) 73:10
(4) 2.5 4.15 50.01 54.15	best(4) 25:11 27:4 79:1 95:10	20:19 20:21 20:23 21:8	City (1) 20.17
attorney(4) 3:5 4:15 52:21 54:16	beth(9) 17:16 18:11 19:6 22:6 22:7	m. in	civil(1) 1:27
attributed(1) 11:21 auditor(2) 21:17 21:20	22:8 24:9 44:24 59:14	c.a(2) 1:6 93:6	cknowledgment(1) 93:1
august(2) 15:13 56:21		calculation(1) 21:2	claim(1) 62:19 claims(1) 85:1
authored(1) 45:7	better(3) 27:17 28:7 29:18	calendar(1) 14:4	clarify(2) 41:5 46:22
authorization(1) 20:23	between(3) 4:2 8:21 73:1	call(4) 24:6 40:10 41:12 79:8 called(6) 1:23 4:11 12:3 67:9 68:13	class(2) 31:20 32:1
authorizing(1) 84:14	big(1) 32:7 bill(4) 19:24 20:11 29:21 57:24	73:10	clear(5) 18:14 18:18 25:6 35:5 49:18
automatic(1) 57:23	bit(1) 78:10		clearly(2) 63:14 82:3
available(1) 25:12	blair(3) 57:21 57:22	came(3) 36:3 37:14 47:19	client(2) 84:17 87:1
average(1) 60:15	board(90) 7:20 8:1 8:7 8:23 19:19	can't(4) 27:7 28:6 33:21 41:5	cmr(1) 50:22
aware(21) 8:1 9:16 10:21 12:8 12:18	21:1 21:5 21:14 21:14 21:18 21:19	cannot(1) 56:5	cmrs(2) 21:4 56:7
12:19 16:9 16:12 16:12 16:18 17:12	26:13 26:16 29:12 29:16 30:13 30:22	captain(20) 16:3 22:19 24:3 26:20	coffee(2) 73:23 73:24
17:16 36:16 37:23 38:2 38:10 60:24 61:3 61:4 89:3 89:8	30:24 31:2 31:8 31:18 32:4 32:24	28:11 30:7 30:11 46:9 48:8 48:22 57:5	1
01.3 01.4 09.3 89.6	33:13 33:19 37:17 40:14 40:17 41:9	68:1 68:18 69:11 69:12 73:11 85:17 86:16 86:22 88:18	collective(2) 20:3 20:5
back(38) 9:13 12:22 13:22 14:5 15:13	41:13 42:2 43:9 50:19 50:21 52:6 52:6 52:11 54:15 55:17 55:18 55:22 55:23	0,0,10 00,22 00,10	columbine(3) 15:18 37:9 47:9 columbine-like(1) 9:13
18:7 21:6 21:21 27:9 27:11 27:12	55:24 56:5 56:7 56:11 57:9 58:6 58:14	captains(1) 20:14	come(14) 8:23 10:14 20:21 34:6 37:18
27:22 29:24 34:6 38:24 50:2 52:11	58:21 59:22 62:12 69:7 69:9 70:19	car(1) 27:23	41:19 41:21 59:5 59:9 65:10 67:24
58:24 59:9 59:11 60:24 61:9 62:10	70:24 71:7 71:9 71:11 71:13 71:13	cardiac(1) 48:4	81:11 82:19 84:5
63:9 64:8 65:10 65:19 66:9 66:11 68:22 71:11 80:18 82:9 84:5 85:18	71:14 71:17 71:19 75:13 77:5 77:14	cardiologists(1) 52:3	
90:12 91:3 91:15	81:12 81:23 82:19 83:14 84:1 84:9 85:16 85:17 86:2 86:10 86:21 87:2	cardiomyopathy(2) 28:18 29:2	comes(4) 32:17 50:2 57:24 58:24
	87:3 88:9 88:13 88:17 88:23 89:9	care(7) 10:8 10:9 11:9 11:10 27:5 69:22 69:24	coming(3) 31:16 37:11 75:16
backlog(1) 58:12	90:11 90:16 90:24 91:3 91:20	09.22 09.24	command(2) 7:17 28:10
bad(1) 31:14		career(1) 28:8	commander(2) 6:23 7:4 commanders(1) 7:5
balances(1) 30:16	board's(4) 30:5 54:16 79:4 79:21	case(13) 8:14 20:8 21:8 36:15 43:1	commencing(2) 1:37 95:14
bang(1) 53:14	boards(1) 41:22	44:1 50:8 52:2 54:19 57:22 58:2 60:12	commission(3) 51:13 90:18 95:23
banging(1) 53:15	boat(1) 48:24	84:23	commissioner(1) 8:9
bank(1) 46;5 bargaining(4) 15:19 16:7 20:3 20:5	bobby(2) 73:10 74:3	cases(4) 43:10 60:8 60:11 60:12	commits(1) 42:14
based(4) 12:11 84:22 84:24 92:1	bonafide(1) 68:4 boss(2) 71:8 71:9	category(1) 21:13	committed(1) 44:4
basically(4) 5:13 43:5 76:21 78:5	boston(3) 2:24 33:10 33:22	catheterization(1) 48:4 caused(1) 29:1	committee(2) 81:22 82:2
basis(4) 12:24 13:9 14:4 20:12	both(5) 11:13 13:10 57:9 83:6 84:20	cc'd(3) 50:12 85:17 91:22	commonwealth(3) 1:31 40:14 95:5
bear(3) 55:3 66:13 68:6	bother(1) 47:18	ceremony(1) 82:10	communications(1) 14:22
bearing(1) 68:7	botieri(46) 10:7 10:11 13:18 16:3	certain(4) 31:20 58:23 63:6 88:18	communities(1) 58:18
because(32) 11:20 13:20 16:14 16:21	21:10 22:20 24:3 24:9 24:13 30:7	certificate(5) 52:4 54:19 62:13 64:22	companies(2) 31:16 31:17
21:17 27:9 29:13 29:20 31:24 33:7	30:11 32:23 37:19 37:19 39:3 46:10	64:22	compensation(2) 17:14 62:8 complained(1) 22:16
43:16 45:19 48:14 48:20 50:3 58:11 59:3 59:7 61:5 63:22 66:3 67:9 67:13	48:9 48:23 68:1 68:18 69:11 69:13 72:12 72:19 73:1 73:11 73:17 74:16		complaining(2) 22:17 22:19
68:12 68:16 69:8 76:16 77:4 78:8 84:8	75:10 77:8 77:17 81:18 82:1 82:5	certification(1) 35:24	complaint(8) 40:21 42:8 43:12 85:20
86:10 88:16	82:11 83:5 83:5 85:17 86:6 86:9 86:22	certified(2) 1:43 66:3	85:24 86:3 86:4 89:13
	88:19 89:7 89:18 91:16 91:22	certify(2) 95:6 95:16 chain(1) 28:10	
become(1) 38:22		abaimman(12) 22-12, 22-15, 22-15, 24-16	complaints(5) 19:8 22:1 28:9 44:21
pefore(20) 1:27 4:9 5:14 11:5 15:21	botieri's(1) 89:13	56:14 56:15 56:19 56:22 69:6 71:9	86:18
25:24 44:1 44:11 48:12 55:2 63:12	box(1) 1:44	71:18 82:1	complete(6) 11:21 48:3 65:22 65:24
56:22 74:7 81:21 82:19 87:2 88:13 88:24 89:4 90:8	boy(1) 79:1 boy(6) 15:22 17:1 24:12 20:2 (1.16)		93:12 93:18
JULE 1 D.T 70,0	boyle(6) 15:23 17:1 24:13 39:2 61:16 62:6	chairman's(1) 63:19	
pegan(1) 55:6		chance(1) 60:17	completely(1) 80:5
peginning(1) 75:19	boys(1) 78:9		computation(1) 21:6
pehalf(3) 2:4 2:19 32:21	brace(1) 39:18		computer(2) 45:19 47:24
	break(1) 5:3	34.1 40.3 43.10 33.13	concerns(8) 7:10 15:3 15:19 16:16
	breath(2) 78:24 79:1	changed(5) 46:1 48:17 49:19 57:1 81:19	16:23 17:2 17:7 17:9
	briefly(2) 11:5 82:15		condition(10) 12:9 12:10 14:14 14:24
	bring(7) 7:8 16:15 21:15 30:4 31:22		15:4 16:10 16:16 17:3 28:17 29:1
	41:23 43:8	charge(4) 27:9 27:11 29:24 46:16	20,17 25,1
	hringing(1) 20·8	charged(3) 30:1 30:2 46:15	
		charging(1) 27:12	
age: 2			08/01/06 16:23:33

KELLEY.WPD

Word Page:Line	Word Page:Line	Word Page:Line	Word Page:Line
conditions(5) 11:6 31:11 31:19 31:21	cut(1) 80:9	detective(1) 78:7	Word Page:Line don't(47) 4:24 8:3 9:11 14:10 15:7
54:13	d.c(1) 33:19	determination(2) 52:9 64:24	15:11 16:20 16:21 17:4 17:4 18:20
1	daily(3) 5:19 7:7 11:16	determined(1) 48:4	23:6 24:15 26:9 28:21 29:6 33:4 33:24
conducted(1) 55:17	dala(3) 41:2 41:13 41:18	dick(3) 8:12 76:17 76:18	34:3 34:15 34:22 34:22 35:5 35:24
conference(8) 32:5 33:1 33:9 40:5	dale(1) 82:2	didn't(25) 9:19 11:1 21:23 22:3 24:10	37:6 37:17 37:20 42:4 43:20 46:16
40:11 40:16 41:17 42:3	dana(9) 15:23 16:1 16:2 17:1 24:1	27:5 43:4 46:17 46:17 55:10 58:16	46:20 53:22 57:20 60:5 60:18 60:20
	62:14 64:13 64:17 65:10	59:20 59:24 61:10 65:2 65:15 68:23	60:21 64:10 64:12 67:19 71:4 75:17
conferences(2) 31:4 33:24		74:10 74:13 77:4 77:11 78:14 79:12	78:7 79:4 79:20 81:23 85:23
conflict(3) 43:17 43:20 43:20	danvers(1) 33:20	82:13 89:11	
connarton(1) 90:15	daryl(1) 44:16		down(12) 12:2 19:13 39:11 42:2 42:23
connolly(1) 41:19	daryl's(2) 44:16 44:17	different(8) 30:10 32:16 60:21 60:21	43:9 45:24 55:9 58:13 62:15 68:16 77:22
consider(1) 49:9	date(23) 14:8 14:9 25:2 25:2 42:9	60:22 76:22 78:3 78:3	1
considering(1) 87:1	48:15 54:14 59:13 60:13 60:14 63:15	1100	dragged(3) 36:2 63:21 63:22
constantly(1) 29:14	66:23 66:24 66:24 67:3 67:4 67:18	differently(1) 52:13	dressed(1) 37:4
contacted(1) 39:16	67:19 71:4 73:3 73:7 84:2 91:8	difficult(1) 27:6	drill(16) 9:13 9:14 9:15 10:18 10:23 10:23 11:18 12:10 14:23 15:5 16:11
contesting(3) 76:4 76:6 76:7	14, 1400) 2.14, 2.10, 2.21, 2.22	direct(2) 3:5 4:15	16:17 35:14 37:8 37:9 37:11
continuation(1) 4:17	dated(29) 3:16 3:18 3:21 3:23 3:25	directed(1) 71:16	10.17 33.14 37.6 37.9 37.11
continue(1) 19:2	3:27 3:32 3:35 3:38 3:41 3:43 3:45	direction(1) 71:12	drills(1) 17:7
continued(1) 1:21	18:12 18:22 23:11 39:23 45:10 50:11 51:2 61:12 62:1 70:6 72:1 72:16 85:7	directives(1) 7:8	drink(1) 48:24
continues(1) 4:14	89:22 91:6 91:7 91:13	directly(2) 76:4 88:19	d-d-d-d-m-(1) 7.11
continuing(2) 4:19 4:23	05.22 51.0 51.7 51.13	director(8) 9:8 50:18 56:11 61:7 70:24	drive(2) 12:1 12:3
contract(4) 31:21 34:16 34:16 35:5	dates(1) 91:4	71:18 85:16 90:16	driven(1) 11:22
contractor(1) 20:6	day(29) 7:14 26:21 28:5 28:5 31:16	#!	due(3) 14:24 29:11 30:12
contracts(1) 31:18	33:9 33:9 33:12 37:14 37:21 39:7	directors(1) 8:21	dug(1) 22:4
contractual(2) 13:8 14:16	39:15 42:20 45:18 46:8 46:15 46:18	disability(1) 51:14	duly(2) 4:13 95:8
contrary(2) 58:24 59:16	46:18 48:12 51:23 54:2 54:11 59:12	disagree(2) 62:24 67:14	durante(1) 12:3
contributory(3) 40:11 41:13 50:18	66:2 68:14 81:6 91:1 91:11 95:19	disappointed(2) 78:22 78:22	durante(1) 12.5 durante's(1) 10:8
conversation(4) 62:23 67:15 67:24 92:1		disappointment(1) 27:19	during(5) 7:23 33:2 35:14 57:9 82:12
	day-to-day(1) 71:10	disbursement(1) 20:10	duties(5) 7:2 7:5 11:17 32:20 81:19
conviction(1) 42:8	days(17) 4:8 6:18 13:3 13:3 13:4 13:5	discipline(2) 11:1 37:21	duty(3) 6:19 63:18 63:18
convictions(1) 44:21	13:6 14:1 14:6 14:19 25:1 47:2 48:12	disciplined(2) 34:10 - 35:10	e-mail(22) 3:18 3:21 3:23 3:25 23:8
	58:14 58:17 60:15 90:18	disclose(1) 84:11	23:9 23:18 23:19 24:6 24:12 24:21
copy(14) 14:6 18:13 25:18 39:1 39:1		disclosing(1) 87:4	32:23 33:1 38:24 39:14 39:22 45:2
	dead(2) 44:16 44:17	disclosure(1) 18:10	45:7 45:10 45:23 57:5 62:23
88.2 69.17 91:10	debra(6) 50:17 54:10 54:11 70:24 71:5	discrepancy(2) 19:9 21:9	
corcoran(4) 1:29 1:42 95:4 95:22	85:15	discuss(5) 16:23 41:21 60:2 68:17 74:1 discussed(13) 16:5 16:6 16:6 16:10	e-mailed(2) 13:15 13:17
. 1.1	dagamhaw(2) 60:10, 70:1	discussed(13) 16:5 16:6 16:6 16:10 24:19 34:9 60:4 74:16 75:1 75:7 85:22	e-mails(4) 23:1 23:2 23:11 25:8
	december(2) 69:19 70:1	89:16 90:17	each(1) 31:24
	decent(1) 59:3	05.10 50.17	earlier(11) 12:23 24:19 57:16 63:6 65:3
	decision(10) 24:19 28:13 41:9 42:22 50:3 50:7 55:21 57:19 57:20 86:11	discussing(1) 19:19	66:8 72:10 76:11 81:3 83:7 91:17
couldn't(7) 11:21 12:1 28:14 40:23	30.3 30.7 33.21 37.19 37.20 80.11	discussion(14) 8:5 15:17 18:6 40:19	ļ
	decisions(6) 41:1 41:21 41:22 41:24	51:8 63:4 64:7 74:17 75:9 77:8 77:16	early(1) 66:18
	50:5 71:11	80:17 83:24 90:4	educational(1) 17:14
counsel(18) 1:23 4:3 4:12 5:4 21:14	71.11		effect(6) 42:16 64:14 79:4 79:20 81:12
38:22 39:2 42:21 43:24 48:5 56:10	declare(1) 32:18	disease(8) 10:8 10:9 11:9 11:9 11:11	82:20
	deeper(1) 22:4	55:6 69:22 69:23	- 4:
	defendant(16) 1:14 1:25 2:19 4:12 19:1		effort(1) 58:18
counting(1) 29:18	23:15 40:1 45:13 51:4 53:2 62:3 70:9	disinterested(1) 95:16	either(2) 6:22 10:20
	72:4 83:20 85:10 90:1	disputing(1) 64:2	eleanor(7) 17:16 19:6 22:6 22:7 22:7
course(1) 5:4		distance(1) 73:11	24:9 44:24
court(12) 1:3 1:29 1:43 41:14 50:3		distress(1) 69:19	dested(2) 10:20, 27:4, 27:5
50:5 68:3 68:15 88:24 93:3 95:4 95:22	defendants(2) 12:8 85:2	district(4) 1:3 1:4 93:3 93:4	elected(3) 19:20 27:4 77:5
	dello(4) 8:17 9:9 56:16 56:18	division(5) 8:13 41:2 41:11 51:13 78:7	election(5) 74:12 74:17 75:10 75:16 76:14
4 (0) 41 17 40 11	deny(1) 42:15	dizzy(3) 11:23 11:24 12:1	170.17
		doctor(4) 47:22 48:1 48:2 48:5	eligible(1) 20:7
cover(9) 26:12 26:15 26:19 27:1 27:2		doctors(6) 10:7 10:10 47:20 54:13	else(16) 9:4 14:13 22:21 24:4 25:21
27:8 33:2 33:8 58:17	12:20 19:23 20:24 22:2 22:9 22:17	62:13 69:21	26:4 29:13 30:19 56:5 63:20 68:9
	22:18 35:18 37:9 49:10 50:21 58:2	100 15	68:19 68:24 76:8 77:19 83:9
coverage(2) 26:23 27:14	61:5 68:10 77:20 86:17	document(9) 18:9 21:7 21:7 28:20 29:3	
covered(3) 27:15 28:1 28:12	3	50:10 52:18 83:12 91:9	embarrassed(1) 30:14
	departments(1) 35:15		emotional(1) 69:19
		documentation(6) 24.11 02.11 02.12	emphatically(2) 49:2 67:13
	1 01/	100.1 00.13 00.10 00.10 10.16	employ(1) 57:9
	depends(4) 31:9 31:9 31:11 31:11		employed(1) 19:22
		documents(17) 13:17 14:7 14:10 17:21	employee(3) 51:13 57:11 79:17
reate(1) 26:22	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	wovenments(17) 13.17 14.7 14.10 17.21	
reate(1) 26:22 redibility(2) 78:23 86:19	deposes(1) 4:14		employee's(1) 57:14
reate(1) 26:22 redibility(2) 78:23 86:19 rime(1) 44:3	deposes(1) 4:14 deposition(16) 1:21 4:7 4:8 4:17 4:19	17:22 25:13 35:4 38:15 38:21 49:6	employee's(1) 57:14 employees(4) 8:6 8:6 20:3 59:23
reate(1) 26:22 redibility(2) 78:23 86:19 rrime(1) 44:3 rriminal(4) 40:21 42:8 43:12 44:21	deposes(1) 4:14 deposition(16) 1:21 4:7 4:8 4:17 4:19 6:5 12:23 38:22 52:22 57:16 65:4 85:3	17:22 25:13 35:4 38:15 38:21 49:6 63:2 66:20 66:22 67:1 67:2 67:8 67:11	employees(4) 8:6 8:6 20:3 59:23
reate(1) 26:22 redibility(2) 78:23 86:19 rrime(1) 44:3 rriminal(4) 40:21 42:8 43:12 44:21 rriteria(1) 20:4	deposes(1) 4:14 deposition(16) 1:21 4:7 4:8 4:17 4:19	17:22 25:13 35:4 38:15 38:21 49:6 63:2 66:20 66:22 67:1 67:2 67:8 67:11	employees(4) 8:6 8:6 20:3 59:23 employer(4) 50:21 59:21 59:23 65:22
reate(1) 26:22 redibility(2) 78:23 86:19 rime(1) 44:3 riminal(4) 40:21 42:8 43:12 44:21 riteria(1) 20:4 rimulative(1) 14:2	deposes(1) 4:14 deposition(16) 1:21 4:7 4:8 4:17 4:19 6:5 12:23 38:22 52:22 57:16 65:4 85:3 92:3 92:6 93:10 95:17	17:22 25:13 35:4 38:15 38:21 49:6 63:2 66:20 66:22 67:1 67:2 67:8 67:11	employees(4) 8:6 8:6 20:3 59:23
reate(1) 26:22 redibility(2) 78:23 86:19 rime(1) 44:3 riminal(4) 40:21 42:8 43:12 44:21 riteria(1) 20:4 rimulative(1) 14:2 rip(1) 73:23	deposes(1) 4:14 deposition(16) 1:21 4:7 4:8 4:17 4:19 6:5 12:23 38:22 52:22 57:16 65:4 85:3 92:3 92:6 93:10 95:17 described(2) 86:22 89:4	17:22 25:13 35:4 38:15 38:21 49:6 63:2 66:20 66:22 67:1 67:2 67:8 67:11	employees(4) 8:6 8:6 20:3 59:23 employer(4) 50:21 59:21 59:23 65:22 employment(2) 20:13 55:6
reate(1) 26:22 redibility(2) 78:23 86:19 rime(1) 44:3 riminal(4) 40:21 42:8 43:12 44:21 riteria(1) 20:4 rimulative(1) 14:2 rip(1) 73:23 rive(1) 32:17	deposes(1) 4:14 deposition(16) 1:21 4:7 4:8 4:17 4:19 6:5 12:23 38:22 52:22 57:16 65:4 85:3 92:3 92:6 93:10 95:17	17:22 25:13 35:4 38:15 38:21 49:6 63:2 66:20 66:22 67:1 67:2 67:8 67:11	employees(4) 8:6 8:6 20:3 59:23 employer(4) 50:21 59:21 59:23 65:22 employment(2) 20:13 55:6 emt(4) 35:22 36:5 36:9 36:17

	KELL	EY.WPD	
Word Page:Line	Word Page:Line	Word Page:Line	Word Page:Line
end(17) 12:10 12:12 15:1 15:5 17:14	express(1) 27:16	forfeiture(2) 44:1 44:3	gone(1) 57:2
17:18 24:23 32:9 51:14 61:7 61:8 68:14 73:9 75:17 75:18 82:15 85:3	extended(1) 74:8	forgive(4) 26:10 53:13 54:1 73:5	good(2) 4:16 31:12
00.14 75.5 75.17 75.18 82.15 85.5	extension(3) 1:35 2:8 95:13	form(2) 4:4 21:16	goodwin(11) 16:2 17:1 23:24 24:1
ended(1) 6:5	extensive(1) 54:12 extra(3) 7:10 27:8 35:13	formal(1) 89:17	62:14 62:20 63:5 64:13 65:1 65:10
ends(1) 29:24	face(1) 74:1	format(1) 24:10 former(2) 44:13 44:23	65:16 got(22) 11:22 13:6 29:7 34:22 34:23
enough(4) 5:11 22:23 38:9 58:17	faced(1) 59:22	formulate(1) 21:1	35:6 37:13 37:16 37:17 38:7 39:11
enters(1) 5:6	facilitates(1) 71:10	forth(4) 12:7 14:21 17:11 66:9	59:7 62:9 64:16 64:18 65:13 65:19
entertained(1) 9:17 entire(2) 54:6 66:24	facing(2) 75:11 76:13	forthcoming(1) 90:20	79:24 80:1 87:24 88:2 91:16
entirely(1) 52:15	fact(8) 3:30 39:7 52:24 54:2 63:4	fortini(2) 75:24 76:2	gayarnad(1) 20:12
equipment(1) 36:1	72:18 87:23 88:5	fortini's(2) 77:9 78:17	governed(1) 20:13 governing(2) 21:7 21:7
errata(2) 93:17 94:1	factors(1) 31:12	fortitude(1) 79:8 forward(1) 24:9	govoni(2) 38:6 38:8
esquire(2) 2:6 2:21	facts(4) 12:7 17:11 54:15 63:16	forwarding(1) 23:17	grab(1) 82:14
essential(1) 11:15	fahy(3) 7:3 26:20 28:11	found(4) 15:10 22:8 44:3 58:13	grabbed(1) 86:16
establish(2) 20:16 20:18 even(4) 12:1 21:23 22:3 34:17	fair(8) 5:11 7:17 33:18 35:22 37:9	four(4) 28:6 52:3 54:18 54:20	granted(1) 51:14
event(4) 21:12 49:11 58:9 59:13	78:19 86:8 90:7	fraud(1) 42:15	grapevine(1) 76:22
ever(16) 7:24 26:22 30:22 43:8 44:19	faking(1) 63:22	friends(1) 48:6	great(1) 18:17 grievance(2) 10:22 11:2
49:5 56:22 65:17 69:6 79:3 79:9 79:1	7 fall(7) 32:6 40:17 41:18 42:5 67:20	front(9) 29:6 35:1 43:18 56:8 58:11 58:21 63:16 64:21 81:11	ground(2) 4:23 53:6
81:10 81:21 82:18 86:7	67:21 67:23	30.21 03.10 04.21 81.11	group(2) 21:3 40:12
every(6) 21:6 30:6 31:16 31:20 41:17	familiar(4) 41:2 41:3 41:4 41:6	fuek(3) 73:15 73:20 73:22	guess(1) 78:8
90:23	fanny(1) 79:2	fulfilled(1) 90:23	guy(1) 8:22
	far(3) 6:18 26:23 91:3	full(3) 13:5 46:17 95:10	guys(4) 33:7 55:12 59:17 77:1
everybody(4) 13:2 41:23 63:20 79:12	fashion(1) 21:16	fun(1) 55:12 functions(1) 11:16	hadn't(1) 74:7 half(3) 13:6 15:21 46:18
everybody's(2) 31:13 31:14 everyone's(1) 13:1	fax(3) 2:10 2:25 47:24	fund(2) 19:20 31:11	halfway(1) 45:24
everything(3) 62:10 62:17 65:21	february(2) 4:17 6:9	funded(1) 32:15	hall(3) 48:11 65:23 77:22
evidence(7) 55:5 58:24 59:16 62:17	feeling(1) 46:9 felt(4) 13:11 13:20 29:20 90:23	funds(2) 20:10 30:23	halt(1) 69:7
63:2 88:2 89:13	few(5) 5:10 7:23 24:19 53:8 56:24	furtado(2) 44:13 44:18	hancock(1) 2:13
	figure(1) 52:1	further(1) 95:16	hand(7) 10:11 34:23 67:1 73:24 74:8 74:9 95:18
evidenced(1) 62:13 evidentiary(1) 55:18	file(16) 11:2 12:12 12:17 12:21 13:1	gallitano(31) 1:33 2:6 2:7 5:6 5:7 5:9 18:15 37:2 44:17 51:5 53:3 53:6 53:10	
exact(4) 16:13 .42:9 54:16 57:21	22:1 34:18 34:19 34:21 35:7 39:8 48:3	53:19 53:21 64:5 80:1 80:4 80:9 80:12	hand-delivered(1) 66:4
exactly(7) 29:4 33:21 34:1 34:15 35:24	65:23 65:24 70:20 81:15	83:21 84:6 86:24 87:11 88:7 88:10	handled(2) 29:24 32:16
46:20 67:19	filed(4) 35:8 46:4 59:12 85:21	88:21 91:6 91:8 92:4 95:12	hands(14) 6:13 24:16 31:17 31:17 39:5
	files(2) 58:9 71:2	gasb(2) 32:7 32:14	45:4 45:17 50:13 54:4 61:14 70:13 72:8 85:13 90:9
examination(4) 1:23 3:5 4:12 4:15 examine(1) 12:4	filing(1) 40:19	gave(21) 10:7 10:11 13:15 13:17 29:21	
examined(1) 93:9	final(2) 52:7 52:9	37:9 47:23 62:14 62:22 65:7 65:8	happened(10) 21:13 21:23 28:7 30:5
example(1) 43:14	finally(2) 22:7 60:14 finance(3) 9:3 9:8 20:2	65:20 66:1 66:20 66:22 67:1 67:8 67:11 68:1 68:15 69:21	32:20 35:11 43:3 52:5 73:1 73:21
examples(1) 23:3	financial(5) 8:15 8:21 32:12 61:6 61:7	07.11 08:1 08:13 09:21	happening(1) 58:15
except(2) 4:4 93:16	financially(2) 31:15 58:19	geez(1) 9:11	happens(2) 57:19 58:5
exchange(1) 86:5 exchanged(2) 66:9 83:6	find(2) 20:21 25:17	general(1) 17:17	happy(1) 31:13
exchanging(1) 59:21	findings(3) 3:30 52:23 54:2	general's(1) 17:13	harassment(6) 17:18 17:19 19:9 23:3
excuse(4) 9:24 43:14 63:8 80:1	fine(3) 18:4 64:4 92:4 finish(9) 4:20 4:20 4:21 43:23 64:3	generated(1) 21:4 generic(1) 13:2	25:9 30:9
excused(3) 15:11 37:24 38:10	77:12 80:2 80:12 92:3	gentleman(1) 76:10	hardoon(1) 2:22
executive(17) 3:40 40:14 83:14 83:17		get(16) 5:15 11:24 17:24 18:13 21:16	harold(1) 60:20
84:2 84:8 84:12 84:13 87:5 87:22 88:4 88:5 88:14 89:15 90:16 91:4 91:5	finished(1) 10:1	29:15 29:16 29:18 33:21 37:17 37:18	haven't(2) 59:7 59:10
30.10 31.4 31.5	fire(3) 20:23 22:2 22:9	58:10 82:9 86:1 87:10 88:1	having(7) 4:12 4:13 12:5 20:1 20:2 95:7 95:8
exercised(1) 13:14	firefighters(3) 58:19 59:5 59:15 fireproof(1) 37:6	gets(3) 13:2 54:16 58:11	33.7 93.6
exeter(1) 2:23	first(13) 10:12 15:12 26:2 36:1 51:11		he's(5) 8:9 9:8 78:24 79:1 84:11
exhibit(71) 3:16 3:18 3:21 3:23 3:25 3:27 3:30 3:32 3:35 3:38 3:40 3:43	54:2 63:10 63:11 70:16 73:18 73:19	give(10) 6:15 22:23 25:18 38:12 39:1	head(4) 50:21 58:2 61:6 69:3
3:45 6:7 6:8 12:6 14:20 15:13 17:10	87:16 87:19	58:23 67:11 68:2 86:19 88:22	health(1) 37:24
18:9 18:21 18:24 19:5 23:7 23:9 23:10	fiscal(1) 24:23		hear(2) 33:7 87:7
23:14 23:18 24:12 25:19 39:21 39:24			heard(6) 7:23 8:5 38:3 42:6 76:16 hearing(2) 44:2 55:18
40:3 45:9 45:12 45:15 49:19 50:24 51:3 51:10 52:21 52:22 53:1 53:18	60:9 77:1 77:5		heart(9) 5:16 47:4 55:6 57:2 57:12
53:24 55:16 61:23 62:2 66:11 66:23		glad(1) 78:1	57:24 58:4 58:7 82:19
70:4 70:8 70:15 71:24 72:3 72:6 83:16		gladly(1) 25:18	1 27.5
83:19 84:3 85:6 85:9 85:22 86:3 86:14	1 = T		heavy(1) 37:5 held(1) 89:15
86:22 89:4 89:14 89:21 89:24 90:7 90:15		- ''	help(7) 27:7 45:22 51:10 55:16 78:4
r · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	flynn(1) 66:6	going(39) 5:9 5:10 5:13 6:3 6:4 6:8	79:4 79:23
exhibits(5) 6:4 38:22 65:4 65:17 66:17	follow(5) 16:14 19:13 19:16 65:1 75:2	6:8 11:19 12:22 22:3 22:9 27:8 27:24	
expect(1) 90:16	follow-up(1) 55:13		helped(1) 79:24
	\ ' '		helping(1) 78:2 her(8) 17:16 19:18 20:8 22:12 71:20
	followe(1) 4:14	88:3 88:14 88:15 88:20 90:6 91:24	76:17 76:23 77:3
explained(3) 12:23 21:11 54:10	forfeits(1) 43:2	92:1 92:2	
Page : 4			hereby(2) 93:8 95:6

08/01/06 16:23:33

	KELL	EY.WPD	
Word Page:Line	Word Page:Line	Word Page:Line	Word Page:Line
hereunto(1) 95:18	inclusive(1) 93:9	it's(44) 8:14 14:3 14:10 17:21 18:2	Word Page:Line knowledge(6) 14:17 25:11 26:22 52:14
hernia(1) 39:11	incorrect(1) 64:17	18:10 18:14 18:18 24:5 28:6 30:9	54:6 95:11
herself(1) 77:2	independent(1) 29:5	32:11 32:15 32:15 32:18 36:20 36:23	
hesse(1) 60:18 hicks(2) 73:10 74:3	indicate(6) 21:5 24:21 29:23 52:3 56:7	36:23 36:24 37:4 37:5 37:6 41:7	knows(1) 79:12
him(65) 12:3 13:15 13:17 13:19 13:22	78:16	41:11 42:3 42:19 43:7 43:20 49:23 50:12 52:20 53:21 57:17 58:3 59:1	kopelman(1) 60:22
17:6 17:6 17:13 21:11 38:3 39:11	indicated(8) 25:7 26:21 27:13 28:24	72:11 73:3 73:4 77:5 78:19 84:3 85:23	kowal(1) 60:20
44:19 48:1 48:10 48:10 49:15 53:14	40:4 42:23 65:3 69:20	91:6	
62:7 62:16 62:22 63:1 65:8 65:20		item(1) 13:8	labor(2) 61:2 61:10 lack(3) 27:16 78:22 78:23
65:21 66:20 66:22 67:3 67:9 67:9 67:11 67:11 67:13 68:1 68:13 68:13	indicates(3) 13:5 81:14 87:9	itself(3) 9:14 45:23 71:17	locking(1) 70-9
68:15 68:15 73:22 74:1 74:4 74:5 74:	indicating(7) 13:15 13:17 28:12 32:13	january(7) 3:32 3:35 61:13 61:21 62:1 70:7 70:21	ladder(1) 41:16
74:7 74:11 74:22 78:2 78:14 78:20	0 32.24 48.1 62.24	70.7 70.21	language(2) 16:13 50:2
78:21 78:22 79:10 79:13 80:2 80:9	indications(1) 87:11	jeremy(1) 2:21	larry(9) 62:23 65:7 65:9 65:20 66:1
81:10 82:14 82:15 82:16 82:17 82:18	individual(7) 21:2 39:9 43:1 44:5	jest(1) 73:12	67:1 67:3 67:12 68:12
83:9 86:15 86:16 87:13 87:15	49:10 58:8 63:15	jesus(2) 11:20 78:1	last(16) 5:14 5:18 5:22 6:4 6:5 8:2
hire(2) 26:11 27:8	1-31-23 N (5) 44 4	job(11) 5:22 11:16 17:18 17:20 27:4	26.9 34:7 34:9 42:11 42:13 42:18
hired(1) 8:22	individual's(1) 44:4 individuals(11) 15:9 15:10 16:23 21:22	29:1 52:5 59:1 59:7 59:10 81:19	42:21 53:10 63:12 66:11
his(36) 8:11 12:4 13:19 13:22 17:14	31:17 43:14 55:24 58:15 59:2 72:23	joe(1) 19:2	
21:11 38:4 39:9 43:2 60:19 62:19	76:22	john(3) 8:18 8:19 38:4	late(1) 30:18
64:23 65:8 65:9 67:1 67:2 73:23 74:8 77:9 77:17 78:22 79:1 79:2 81:2 81:3	influence(1) 86:11	joined(1) 5:7	lately(1) 32:7 later(2) 47:2 60:17
81:19 81:19 82:6 82:14 84:10 86:10	information(14) 7:9 16:9 16:18 16:20	joseph(5) 1:33 2:6 2:7 90:15 95:12	law(9) 1:31 41:3 41:11 41:15 41:15
86:12 86:19 87:1 88:7 95:9	34:17 35:6 44:12 44:19 63:6 64:18 66:3 87:9 87:24 87:24	july(11) 3:25 24:23 25:1 45:11 45:16	50:8 50:8 57:12 95:12
	00.3 01.3 01.24 01.24	46:1 46:4 54:2 54:3 91:18 95:19	
history(1) 54:7	initially(1) 65:5	jump(2) 5:14 34:8	lawfully(4) 34:23 35:6 87:23 88:3
hold(2) 15:2 44:2 holiday(2) 19:24 20:11	injured(1) 39:6	june(19) 1:37 3:43 3:45 24:22 24:24	lawsuit(1) 88:20
home(8) 11:19 11:19 11:20 11:22 12:1	injury(5) 39:8 57:2 57:8 58:1 63:15	39:3 42:23 48:2 48:8 48:16 48:22	lay(1) 12:2 least(5) 37:10 61:1 86:8 89:4 91:3
13:7 47:19 74:23	injury-on-duty(3) 62:8 62:18 63:14	75:19 75:19 85:8 85:18 89:23 90:12	leave(3) 49:1 80:20 80:23
	inspection(1) 8:12	93:11 95:14 just(81) 5:7 5:9 5:16 6:15 6:16 8:3	leaving(1) 73:9
honest(1) 42:4	inspector(3) 8:10 17:13 17:17 instance(2) 23:17 33:17	11:4 11:5 11:8 12:15 15:9 16:14 16:22	left(13) 4:23 5:14 6:10 6:20 46:11
hope(4) 79:4 79:20 81:11 82:18	instructed(2) 76:17 84:17	18:8 18:14 18:17 22:11 22:18 23:6	46:13 56:20 56:20 74:2 74:3 78:15
hopefully(2) 4:19 92:3 hoping(1) 4:21	instructors(1) 36:8	26:4 26:6 26:10 27:6 31:13 34:8 35:17	79:13 82:14
hospital(6) 39:15 46:9 47:4 47:19	instruments(1) 31:15	37:18 38:21 39:20 41:4 42:11 42:11 42:13 42:17 42:19 42:20 42:23 46:8	legal(1) 50:5 legislation(1) 32:8
63:23 64:22	insult(1) 49:9	46:10 48:11 49:3 49:12 49:18 51:10	legitimate(2) 13:13 13:20
	insurance(2) 81:22 82:2	52:11 52:16 52:16 52:19 53:8 53:13	lehane(1) 60:19
hours(2) 4:22 29:21	interaction(1) 72:18 interest(2) 27:4 59:18	54:7 55:3 55:10 55:12 55:16 55:16	let(10) 5:1 5:2 5:3 5:4 64:3 64:11 65:1
house(3) 39:10 47:24 59:6	interesting(1) 61:5	55:22 59:20 59:23 64:1 64:11 64:21	66:10 80:1 89:19
however(2) 4:8 49:18 hurting(2) 59:14 59:23	internal(1) 21:19	65:1 66:13 67:2 67:16 69:4 70:18 71:9 73:6 75:2 75:5 76:15 77:5 77:12 79:13	
hyannis(1) 33:19	international(1) 31:10	80:15 84:2 90:2 91:14 91:24	63:16 64:5 70:4 85:5 91:5
hypertension(1) 55:5	interpreted(3) 41:24 41:24 42:18		35.5 51.5
i'd(8) 18:2 25:17 29:3 29:6 32:24		just.(1) 29:8	letter(64) 3:16 3:27 3:32 3:35 3:38
32:24 40:23 48:20	interrogatory(4) 12:6 14:21 17:10 25:19 interrupted(1) 90:21		3:43 3:45 10:5 12:24 13:2 13:11 13:20
i'll(4) 28:20 64:12 84:2 84:5		keep(2) 5:9 35:7	13:23 14:15 18:8 18:10 18:22 19:5 19:11 19:18 22:12 22:14 49:5 50:17
i'm(70) 4:21 5:9 5:13 6:2 6:3 6:4 6:7			50:20 50:22 51:1 51:20 51:23 61:12
6:8 6:12 10:1 12:14 12:18 16:12 16:12	into(15) 22:4 22:6 22:8 22:15 24:6	18:8 18:11 23:23 59:6 70:12 84:7 89:3	61:16 61:24 66:7 66:11 70:6 70:11
16:14 23:20 25:6 26:6 27:9 28:17		93:8 95:7	70:14 70:16 70:23 71:23 72:1 72:11
28:17 29:7 34:7 34:8 36:16 36:24 38:17 39:1 45:23 47:1 47:7 49:3 49:7	67:24 68:11 77:24 88:9	kelley's(1) 85:1	72:12 73:3 73:7 73:7 77:21 81:14 82:1 82:4 85:7 85:15 85:22 89:6 89:17
49:12 49:16 49:18 50:10 51:19 53:12	l.	kennedy(1) 39:10	89:22 90:7 90:13 90:14 90:18 91:2
53:13 53:14 59:6 63:1 63:8 63:24 64:1	investigated(1) 91:2	kept(1) 24:10	91:13 91:17 91:18
66:19 67:13 68:7 75:5 76:24 78:1	investigation(6) 86:21 87:12 87:14	kesten(1) 2:22	Internal 2014 25 2
79:14 80:12 80:14 83:11 84:7 84:19 85:2 86:24 87:12 88:3 88:11 88:15	87:16 87:20 88:8	KCYIII(4) 1.3 33.3 33.11 44:18	letters(2) 10:14 25:8 level(1) 66:21
00 17 00 00 00 10 00 10 00 10 10 10 10 10 10		Maintocrty(1) 41.20	liar(2) 63:19 63:20
		Kiliu(3) 22.23 42.0 01.3	lie(1) 68:4
rve(4) 36:22 71:7 71:19 79:24		kingston(1) 1:45	lieutenant(7) 6:24 7:4 7:13 26:20 28:11
ideas(1) 59:21	le ' //2	kissing(1) 79:1	33:5 45:19
dentified(2) 4:13 95:8	iod(1) 50:6	knew(3) 38:5 38:11 48:20	W(27) 10-14 12-(14) 14 - 1-
identify(1) 84:2 illnesses(1) 10:6	issue(17) 15:18 21:12 21:17 32:8 32:11	know(58) 5:1 5:2 5:3 5:4 7:20 9:10	like(27) 10:14 13:6 14:4 14:15 15:8 16:22 18:11 21:21 23:7 24:12 24:13
micsacs(1) 10.0	44:2 44:3 57:8 58:3 68:17 81:8 86:4	14:8 14:10 15:11 16:5 16:6 16:22	29:14 36:20 36:23 36:23 36:24 37:5
mpact(2) 15:19 16:7	86:19 87:21 87:22 88:4 88:6	20.14 21.15 22.4 22.4 22.24 24.22	37:18 38:7 45:16 48:11 68:15 68:20
mpacts(1) 32:14	issued(1) 88:5	29:14 31:15 33:4 33:4 33:24 34:22 34:23 35:5 35:24 36:10 36:22 36:24	69:20 75:18 78:11 84:4
nability(4) 14:23 15:4 16:11 16:17	issues(9) 15:3 15:9 32:7 42:10 52:10	37:6 39:17 42:4 42:10 44:12 46:16	limitations(4) 42:12, 42:20, 42:21
nadequacies(1) 52:10	57:24 78:3 78:3 92:2	47:18 51:24 55:10 57:20 60:5 60:18	limitations(4) 42:12 42:20 42:24 43:5 linda(4) 1:29 1:42 95:4 95:22
ncident(6) 43:3 47:9 54:8 54:14 54:17]	00:20 00:21 04:11 00:5 07:5 75:17	line(2) 57:7 84:16
75:9	l,	78:4 78:24 79:7 79:15 79:15 80:13 80:13 85:23 87:19	
nclude(2) 25:8 69:11		50,00	
2000 15			

KELLEY.WPD

Word Page:Line	Word Page:Line	Word Page:Line	Word Page:Line
line: (14) 94:3 94:6 94:9 94:12	matter(7) 39:7 59:21 84:23 88:9 88:12		now(13) 9:5 9:5 9:8 14:12 32:11 44:6
94:15 94:18 94:21 94:24 94:27 94:30 94:33 94:36 94:39 94:42	89:16 91:2	moore(1) 69:24	44:14 46:11 57:15 58:18 60:12 62:5
(27.33 27.30 <u>7</u> 4.37 <u>74.42</u>	matters(1) 00:17	more(5) 26:5 26:5 53:14 78:10 86:7	86:3
listed(1) 25:23	matters(1) 90:17 maybe(5) 9:11 15:20 37:6 75:18 75:19	morning(3) 15:10 38:11 86:15	number(13) 6:3 21:6 29:22 31:12 32:17 34:4 52:1 58:14 60:4 60:7 60:12
listing(1) 25:20	mean(12) 8:3 26:1 27:22 28:6 28:21	most(2) 7:3 7:9	87:22 87:22
little(4) 30:3 73:13 73:24 78:10	31:12 47:13 52:2 60:9 63:13 72:21	mother's(1) 39:7	O', EE O', EE
live(1) 74:24	80:9	motion(1) 88:24 motions(1) 4:5	numbered(1) 54:3
lives(2) 58:12 59:17	meaning(3) 30:10 34:8 66:14	move(5) 50:9 83:11 85:1 85:4 85:5	numbers(3) 20:19 20:24 28:23
llp(1) 2:22	medical(35) 11:6 12:9 12:10 12:11	mrs(3) 18:11 59:14 66:6	numerous(1) 50:4
lockbox(1) 88:1	12:16 12:20 13:13 13:18 13:18 14:14	much(2) 30:3 37:13	o'clock(1) 13:6
long(8) 27:1 33:15 53:13 55:15 56:14 59:19 60:2 71:16	14:24	multiple(1) 27:23	oath(4) 4:14 15:13 84:10 95:9
39.19 00.2 /1.10	58:11 58:24 59:1 59:8 59:9 62:11 63:1	municipal(1) 20:2	object(4) 9:14 10:16 30:4 84:15
look(11) 22:15 24:6 28:20 33:23 38:20	100 - 01 - 01 - 01 - 01 - 01	must(6) 30:18 30:19 35:12 56:3 63:17	objecting(1) 84:7
40:24 52:8 52:11 62:15 86:13 91:5		63:22	objection(5) 9:16 9:21 84:4 86:24 87:8 objections(1) 4:3
	medically(1) 69:15	myself(8) 8:3 39:9 52:15 55:20 72:23	obligated(1) 43:23
looked(3) 22:6 22:8 88:9	medication(3) 5:15 11:12 12:2	73:15 73:20 74:2	obligation(4) 12:19 14:16 43:13 90:23
looking(7) 31:10 34:1 34:8 53:14 70:20) medications(1) 5:17 medicin s(1) 5:16		october(2) 64:13 95:24
73:6 77:22	medicine(1) 5:16 meet(3) 31:20 31:23 31:23	name(8) 8:11 28:6 38:4 54:12 57:21	odometer(2) 34:10 34:10
looks(6) 18:11 23:7 24:12 24:13 45:16		60:19 81:3 81:3	off(22) 4:23 5:14 6:4 6:10 17:24 18:5
52:7	16:22 19:21 20:9 20:18 20:19 23:21	nomed(1) 44:13	18:6 18:19 43:15 44:6 46:18 51:5 51:8
	24:2 26:13 26:16 27:1 29:23 29:23	named(1) 44:13 names(1) 28:6	64:5 64:7 80:10 80:15 80:17 83:21 83:24 90:2 90:4
losing(2) 59:6 59:6	30:1 30:6 33:10 42:20 64:19 64:20	mames(1) 25:0 mear(1) 82:17	03.24 70.2 70.4
loss(1) 62:8	65:9 67:10 68:17 72:20 77:23 81:22 82:4 82:7 82:7	necessary(1) 90:23	office(8) 4:18 12:4 17:13 17:16 17:17
lot(3) 32:18 77:2 77:3	02.4 02.7 02.7	need(11) 5:1 5:3 5:3 43:23 44:6 53:8	21:11 44:4 84:11
loyal(1) 78:11 lyme(3) 10:9 11:11 69:23	meetings(1) 83:15	75:6 79:4 79:20 81:23 91:12	
lynn(3) 75:23 76:1 76:3	member(13) 19:19 19:21 20:5 31:8		officer(18) 6:18 7:2 7:6 7:24 8:15
macrs(2) 40:10 41:18	40:14 41:10 56:2 56:7 71:14 77:23	needed(1) 78:4	11:16 26:12 26:18 32:21 39:10 44:13 44:14 57:10 63:5 74:1 79:17 80:20
madden(1) 8:18	84:10 85:18 90:12	needham(3) 21:17 21:18 21:19	83:2
madden's(1) 8:19	mambarls(1) 21-2	never(45) 9:16 10:19 10:21 13:21 13:22 13:23 14:18 20:19 20:20 20:20	officer's(1) 57:21
made(11) 9:16 10:19 21:19 28:14	member's(1) 21:3 members(5) 20:23 21:22 37:10 77:5	26:14 27:14 28:1 28:12 30:5 33:11	officers(15) 7:10 7:17 7:19 26:24 27:16
47:22 49:14 66:23 69:12 82:21 86:9	91:20	34:21 36:1 37:7 38:2 38:5 38:11 49:4	27:21 28:3 35:23 36:5 36:9 36:17
86:12 magistrate(1) 41:20		49:4 49:14 63:5 64:16 64:17 65:4	36:18 37:24 39:2 63:21
magistrate(1) 41:20 magistrates(1) 41:18	membership(2) 15:2 77:6	65:12 65:13 68:4 68:18 69:5 69:12 74:6 74:13 74:16 75:1 75:7 81:11	offices(2) 1:31 95:12
main(3) 1:33 2:8 95:13	memory(1) 89:12		okay(27) 14:5 19:2 38:16 38:20 41:8
major(1) 32:12	meniere's(5) 10:8 11:8 11:9 12:5 69:22		41:19 44:2 44:7 44:8 47:7 49:23 50:3
make(12) 7:7 10:16 10:22 25:19 26:6	mention(3) 20:11 77:21 81:3	new(9) 5:20 6:1 7:8 7:8 7:10 31:10	52:12 54:14 55:4 56:14 57:2 62:14
30:3 31:13 41:8 52:9 64:23 81:21 86:6	mentioned(5) 5:18 11:5 17:1 76:11 81:2 met(3) 12:3 31:19 68:13	31:15 31:16 41:24	64:4 73:8 73:13 80:3 80:3 80:6 80:11
makeup(2) 6:20, 77:4	michael(5) 72:12 72:19 73:1 81:4 91:22	new#(10) 4:00 F0:0 51:00 71 00 70 01	88:15 91:11
makeup(2) 6:20 77:4 making(3) 19:3 31:14 55:12	IIIIIUUIE(Z) 40;Z /3;19	170·1 85·6 80·20 01·11 02·2	old(3) 42:13 53:6 73:13
manager(9) 17:15 19:7 10:8 24:6 21:10	might(5) 10:13 13:3 58:11 60:20 75:18 mike(3) 42:21 73:12 73:22	7.7.1 32.0 07.20 71.11 72.3	on-the-job(1) 42:15
31:18 31:22 44:24 58:3	Market(5) 12.21 13.12 13.22	micenes(1) 65:0	once(2) 55:6 86:2
	miller(1) 9:5	night(13) 73:9 74:6 74:13 75:8 77:14	one(35) 2:23 6:15 7:11 10:7 19:16
managers(2) 31:6 33:10	million(1) 31:5	82:9 82:12 82:16 82:16 82:23 82:24	21:13 23:20 23:20 23:22 27:24 29:13
mandated(1) 63:17		83:2 83:5	31:20 31:24 32:1 32:5 32:7 37:7 37:14
mandatory(1) 10:24	minute(11) 34:6 43:15 43:16 51:6 64:5 81:20 83:15 83:22 86:1 87:10 91:5	nine(1) 31:5	42:11
manfredi(4) 8:12 76:9 76:10 76:19	4		85:23 87:22 90:2 91:10
manning(1) 6:23 many(9) 13:5 13:5 31:7 32:4 33:7 36:7	minutes(15) 3:40 5:10 18:2 24:19	nomination(4) 77:9 77:17 77:23 78:17	
58:7 60:5 60:6	29:19 29:22 30:18 56:24 82:6 82:7	nonboard(1) 86:4	one-piece(1) 37:5
1		none(3) 7:22 36:12 55:8	ones(2) 5:18 60:21
march/april(1) 10:14	Imienwanau-aa(1) 20.10	Dominicultaria (1) 5 1.7	ongoing(3) 20:1 20:12 20:21
mark(17) 18:14 18:20 23:6 23:8 23:10	lwsianamusaa-4-3(1) 77.0	nos(2) 23:7 23:14	only(10) 7:16 36:8 46:18 47:20 47:21 58:6 63:13 68:11 77:5 82:15
38:21 39:20 45:9 50:24 52:22 61:23	micetating(1) 20.20	notarial(1) 95:19	00.0 00.10 00.11 //.0 02.13
70:4 71:24 83:13 83:15 85:5 89:20	mietalra(1) 21-24	notary(2) 4:9 95:5	onto(1) 63:20
marked(25) 6:3 6:7 6:9 18:23 23:13	mistalzas(1) 21:10	HULCL31 20.10 20 24 04 4	open(1) 43:7
25:6 39:24 45:11 45:15 51:3 52:21	microad(1) 20:22	notes(9) 10:7 10:11 12:12 12:16 12:20	operations(1) 71:10
52:24 53:18 62:2 62:5 65:18 70:8	molloy(1) 10:10	13:18 16:21 34:8 69:21	opportunity(1) 86:6
	molloy's(1) 11:10		opposition(4) 74:11 75:10 75:21 76:13
			order(3) 80:20 80:23 89:11
market(1) 31:11 markets(2) 31:12 31:14		MONEC(1) 57.15 57.15 57.10 60.22	ordered(2) 21:20 89:8
markets(2) 31:12 31:14 massachusetts(10) 1:4 1:27 1:31 1:35		BORECO(2) 25.0 57.17	original(1) 24:15 other(33) 4:21 7:16 7:19 8:5 8:6 9:20
		nomicution(1) 00.0	14:12 17:7 17:8 23:1 23:2 25:13 25:13
	manifor(2) (.10 7.17	noffs:(2) 10:4 14:12 22:22	25:14 26:11 26:21 28:1 29:16 33:12
material(2) 37:6 68:2	montequed(1) 7/2	november(2) 64:20, 67:22, 69:22	36:17 37:1 37:23 42:20 52:14 54:11
	month(3) 15:20 15:20 75:17	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	63:21 66:15 66:17 66:21 72:23 82:24
	month's(3) 24:22 24:22 37:10		83:2 88:4
Page : 6			08/01/06 16:23:33

Word Page:Line	Word Page:Line	Word Page:Line	Word Page:Line
otherwise(1) 79:18	peddell(3) 81:4 81:10 81:17	position(11) 8:19 19:20 26:18 27:5	q.all(7) 29:9 49:3 49:12 65:1 72:24
our(8) 6:5 29:22 31:18 32:2 32:12	penalizing(1) 59:17	27:9 30:23 69:6 69:8 77:13 81:17 87:1	90:21 91:14
42:21 87:24 92:1	pension(1) 43:2		
1000 1014 15 10 00 01 01 00 00	people(19) 21:20 27:13 28:2 28:12	positions(1) 77:1	q.along(1) 35:20
out(29) 10:14 15:10 20:21 21:22 27:9	29:15 29:16 40:20 42:7 43:6 58:13	possession(3) 65:8 67:3 82:6	q.and(34) 23:6 23:17 24:12 24:18 31:7
29:15 29:16 31:16 33:21 36:2 46:6	59:3 60:22 61:9 76:23 76:24 77:3 77:3	3 possibly(1) 6:21	33:2 35:22 39:13 40:3 42:14 44:23
46:8	79:24 88:1	posture(1) 6:23	45:7 49:18 50:17 52:13 56:11 56:22
68:3 74:19 76:16 78:2 78:8 86:18	(7) 00.5 00 7 00 0 10 00 15	practice(3) 20:1 22:8 60:1	61:16 62:20 67:5 67:15 69:11 71:3
70.2 70.20 70.2 70.0 00.10	perac(7) 89:5 89:7 89:8 89:12 89:17 90:16 91:3	precedent-setting(1) 41:22	71:16 72:16 72:22 75:16 75:21 76:1
outcome(1) 87:13	90.10 91.3	preclude(1) 56:8	76:4 85:20 89:8 91:17 91:22
outside(1) 65:16	percent(1) 21:9	precluded(2) 52:15 55:20	g cmy/1) 92.2
over(18) 8:21 20:22 21:21 25:1 25:24	nerfectly(1) 50:5	preemployment(1) 54:22	q.any(1) 83:2 q.anyone(1) 22:21
28:8 29:18 30:15 31:5 34:4 34:12 43:2	nerform(1) 11:15	preexisting(7) 11:6 12:9 14:24 15:3	q.anything(2) 6:1 83:9
53:5 53:7 60:4 71:12 73:10 73:14	perhaps(1) 18:13	16:10 16:16 17:3	q.are(3) 33:13 37:16 37:23
	period(2) 21:21 32:3	preliminary(4) 47:20 47:23 63:11 66:21	
overall(1) 36:23	periods(1) 33:3		g.at(2) 77:16 81:7
overalls(1) 36:19	perkins(1) 2:22	prerogative(1) 58:4 present(9) 12:17 15:22 21:11 24:1	q.back(4) 48:8 48:16 56:17 60:16
overtime(2) 19:24 20:12	person(2) 58:21 95:17	34:16 35:15 36:17 82:3 88:23	q.besides(1) 22:23
own(4) 20:16 47:24 59:23 72:24	personal(3) 48:5 49:9 86:5	34.10 33.13 30.17 62.3 66.23	q.but(6) 29:5 65:10 71:14 74:24 78:19
oxygen(2) 36:1 36:3	personally(1) 78:4	presentation(1) 84:14	91:1
p.c(1) 2:12	personnel(12) 12:12 12:17 12:21 19:22		1
p.m(3) 1:37 92:5 95:15	20:4 20:18 20:21 21:8 34:18 65:23	president(3) 15:2 61:17 62:7	q.dated(1) 61:21
package(2) 66:24 68:1	65:24 66:9	pressure(1) 28:1	q.dennis(1) 38:6
page(5) 3:3 3:14 49:22 57:17 70:3		pretty(3) 27:2 31:13 55:11	q.did(28) 24:3 27:16 31:2 43:8 44:19
page: (14) 94:3 94:6 94:9 94:12	persuade(1) 57:10	preventing(1) 40:20	47:17 54:24 57:5 65:16 68:9 68:19
94:15 94:18 94:21 94:24 94:27 94:30 94:33 94:36 94:39 94:42	pertained(1) 44:20	previous(3) 12:22 14:3 85:22	69:6 72:18 74:11 77:8 78:13 78:16
94.33 94.30 94.39 94.42	pertinent(1) 55:11	previously(2) 52:20 82:21	79:3 79:9 80:20 80:23 81:10 81:21
pages(1) 93:9	phone(3) 46:20 62:22 67:9	prior(21) 8:3 9:14 9:22 10:23 11:7	82:14 82:18 82:23 83:4 88:12
paid(5) 20:3 20:4 20:12 29:22 46:18	phonetic(1) 41:19		m d=(7) 22.10 28.0 28.04 26.4 40 m
paige(1) 60:22	physical(3) 54:22 55:1 69:18	11:18 12:17 14:1 14:14 14:23 15:20 19:18 25:2 48:1 54:14 62:7 65:9 69:14	4.00(7) 22:10 28:9 28:24 36:4 40:7 45:5 50:15
panel(14) 50:2 52:2 54:16 58:6 58:11	physically(1) 82:11	69:24 75:9 89:16	1-5.5 50.15
58:13 58:24 59:1 59:9 62:11 62:13	physicians(3) 25:20 47:22 58:7		q.during(1) 32:3
63:1 64:23 67:14	piece(3) 35:1 37:18 50:10	probably(1) 67:17	g.fair(2) 38:9 85:15
	pinehills(1) 72:21	problem(4) 59:22 76:3 79:6 90:22	q.for(2) 33:17 71:21
panel's(1) 50:7	place(7) 46:12 67:16 74:3 80:21 80:24 88:2 88:8	problems(1) 26:23	q.forgive(1) 38:4
panels(2) 58:7 59:8	00.2 00.0	procedurally(1) 38:18	q.had(1) 74:8
paper(4) 29:7 35:1 37:19 50:11	placed(1) 36:2	procedure(4) 1:27 32:10 38:3 88:1	q.help(1) 46:22
papers(8) 48:6 48:12 48:14 76:23 77:9	plaintiff(2) 1:10 2:4	procedures(2) 56:7 56:9 process(3) 15:11 41:8 69:8	g.how(6) 33:15 36:7 37:13 59:19 60:2
77:17 77:23 78:17	plaza(1) 2:23	produce(1) 13:12	77:19
	please(7) 5:2 5:4 12:7 14:21 17:11	produced(7) 14:11 14:11 17:21 25:16	
paperwork(2) 58:10 65:19	51:12 64:11	28:16 63:2 64:21	q.i(7) 26:9 28:22 34:2 34:13 35:3
paragraph(7) 40:3 46:2 51:11 54:2 55:17 70:16 90:15			70:11 74:21
	plymouth(22) 1:13 1:35 2:9 7:20 7:24	production(6) 13:16 18:10 23:2 25:7	
part(11) 8:24 9:1 9:2 14:16 31:2 38:22	8:7 35:17 35:19 55:7 56:2 56:4 61:19	135-4 40-5	q.i'm(14) 26:4 36:16 38:14 41:6 45:2
54:9 55:11 55:20 63:14 87:5			47:3 49:7 55:22 73:4 73:16 76:18 83:11 85:12 90:6
	84:1 93:10 95:2 95:13	profanity(1) 83:4	03.11 ,63.12 90.0
partial(1) 2:6		program(2) 15:18 63:17	q.in(4) 25:13 25:19 37:8 67:23
participate(8) 9:21 10:17 11:1 14:24	plymouth's(3) 20:15 50:18 56:3	Invoceenter(1) 69:12	q.is(1) 86;8
15:4 16:11 16:17 88:12	point(20) 13:2 14:4 14:5 21:10 41:14	Inrotection(1) 13:10	q.it(2) 34:21 90:11
	41:15 41:15 42:2 46:6 47:12 48:4 48:19 57:17 58:1 59:20 73:23 74:18		q.just(7) 25:6 35:18 38:18 45:22 51:10
participating(1) 89:9	81:5 81:7 89:1		68:6 79:16
participation(5) 9:15 10:22 29:12 30:13	01.5 01.7 05,1	providers(1) 26:7	
37:24	police(27) 6:18 7:19 7:24 11:16 12:20	provision(1) 19:23	q.let(5) 61:12 70:3 77:12 82:9 86:20
	19:23 20:13 20:14 20:14 22:16 22:17		q.let's(3) 50:9 52:18 71:23
particular(5) 6:19 13:4 42:24 44:23	26:12 32:20 35:20 35:21 36:20 50:19	public(7) 1:29 7:11 51:13 78:14 81:21	q.may(2) 25:4 47:9
84:23	57:10 58:2 58:19 59:14 67:24 68:9	197-0 05-5	g.mr(1) 76:10
antiquiado (2) 15-7 17-22 51-21	77:20 79:17 83:2 86:17	. (1) 22 42	q.my(2) 24:8 87:19
particularly(3) 15:7 17:22 51:21		puerto(1) 33:19	q.name(1) 28:3
	1	purpose(1) 70:23	q.never(1) 74:14
			q.no(3) 38:20 47:1 64:1
passed(2) 42:23 54:22 past(1) 7:23		purposes(1) 27:14	q.now(5) 22:1 35:14 40:16 54:21 69:14
		pursuant(5) 1:25 20:4 20:16 21:2 21:3	q.okay(9) 10:3 19:17 35:9 57:18 66:13
		pusn(2) 59:19 59:20	72:10 73:21 76:20 81:16
		put(22) 24:21 25:1 28:1 30:15 32:19 33:11 35:1 42:12 46:4 46:11 47:17	(1) (0.00
pause(3) 6.17 18.19 38:13 pay(7) 19:9 21:20 26:11 46:17 46:17	MILT 27.7 47.10 U2./ U0.24 81:18	10.6 10.11 10.12 10.14 10.10 10.20	q.on(1) 48:22
	portfolio(i) 32:2	49-22 49-23 55-9 60-7 90-22	q.prior(2) 57:8 74:4
	portion(1) 4:21		q.relative(2) 81:2 85:24
			q.right(2) 44:11 47:6
	1 6 (-)	g.a(1) 69:2	q.showing(4) 45:15 53:18 62:5 72:6
payroll(2) 20:24 21:9		q.about(1) 60:6	į.
(-)	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	· '\ / ****	

08/01/06 16:23:33

KELLEY.WPD

Word Page:Line q.so(7) 42:5 66:10 67:7 70:23 75:2	Word Page:Line	Word Page:Line	Word Page:Line
q.so(7) 42:5 66:10 67:7 70:23 75:2 75:8 83:7	recall(8) 15:16 17:4 28:3 34:11 40:9 67:15 71:3 83:9	represent(1) 89:1	running(5) 58:16 75:13 75:21 76:8
	01.10 11.0 00.9	representative(2) 13:12 14:22 represents(1) 40:13	russo(4) 8:17 9:9 56:16 56:18
1.that's(3) 26:6 49:16 73:18	received(5) 13:21 14:18 49:4 65:4 86:3	represents(1) 40:13	sacco(2) 42:21 52:21
1.the(4) 23:2 55:24 56:14 67:21	receiving(2) 10:5 40:20	request(8) 13:23 48:16 49:19 66:22	safety(4) 35:22 36:5 36:9 36:17 said(42) 11:12 14:15 17:5 21:15 32:5
1.this(3) 22:13 23:21 51:20	recent(2) 41:21 42:22	70:16 70:17 70:23 88:21	34:2 37:14 43:5 43:7 46:9 48:10 48:1
ı.to(4) 26:15 26:22 54:6 79:11	recently(1) 42:11	300 (00) (00) (00) (00) (00) (00) (00) (48:13 49:12 57:22 61:6 61:7 62:24
4.try(1) 79:14	recess(1) 44:9	requested(6) 45:23 63:6 65:21 66:14	64:17 65:12 67:10 67:10 67:12 67:13
q.vacation(1) 47:15	recognize(9) 45:3 45:5 50:15 59:24	71:3 71:4	68:2 69:20 73:1 73:11 73:11 73:12
q.was(3) 34:19 40:19 63:4	61:13 70:11 72:7 72:9 85:12		73:13 73:18 73:19 73:22 74:5 77:24
q.we(1) 56:24	1 (1) (2) (2)	requesting(1) 13:19	78:5 78:6 78:9 82:16 86:15 91:12
g.we'll(1) 34:6	recollection(1) 29:5	required(7) 13:9 31:5 50:22 50:22 52:8	
q.well(4) 33:23 34:24 43:18 43:22	recommended(1) 61:2	54:11 62:17	salary(1) 21:3 same(12) 4:23 5:18 54:17 55:18 55:22
q.were(10) 30:7 30:11 36:9 60:24 59:18 69:24 70:20 71:8 75:13 76:13	recommending(1) 61:11	reservations(1) 87:23	55:23 55:24 66:1 76:10 81:17 93:12
39.18 09.24 70.20 71.8 73.13 70.13	reconsider(I) 62:18 record(33) 12:12 12:16 17:24 18:5	reserve(4) 84:20 85:3 88:15 88:20	93:17
q.what(5) 32:20 56:19 67:18 71:5 89:1		reserved(2) 4:4 4:6	satisfactorily(2) 4:13 95:7
q.what's(2) 27:11 70:15	33:12 39:20 43:15 44:6 51:5 51:8	reserving(1) 88:16	say(48) 7:17 10:13 11:19 12:16 13:13
whatever(1) 75:5	51:18 64:6 64:7 64:8 69:4 72:14 80:15	resolved(1) 89:16	14:3 14:5 15:16 17:5 22:7 23:3 30:18
when(3) 22:5 22:16 47:11	80:17 80:18 81:24 83:21 83:24 84:19	respect(1) 86:13	33:6 33:8 33:11 33:18 35:22 36:7
J.where(1) 40:9	88:21 90:2 90:4 95:10	respective(1) 4:3	36:21 36:24 37:9 37:13 38:7 39:13
n.whether(1) 68:24		respond(1) 84:17	42:18 49:10 50:5 51:18 52:12 58:20
J.which (1) 27:21	recorded(2) 93:14 93:19	responded(2) 13:23 91:15	59:6 60:13 64:14 65:13 66:16 68:9 68:19 74:4 78:19 78:23 79:9 79:12
j.while(1) 30:21	records(11) 13:13 13:18 19:10 63:7	response(1) 14:18	79:17 82:18 82:23 85:15 86:8 90:7
q.who(3) 23:23 66:5 76:8	64:15 64:15 64:20 64:23 65:3 65:5 66:8	responsibility(1) 32:10	75.17 62.10 62.25 65.15 66.8 96.7
q.why(1) 51:23	reelection(1) 75:15	rest(1) 55:11	saying(15) 29:15 29:17 33:7 36:12
q.would(1) 90:14	refer(1) 6:9	restore(1) 57:13	36:14 37:16 37:20 46:10 66:19 67:7
1.yeah(3) 19:12 19:15 44:15	reference(1) 10:17	restricted(1) 48:18	73:7 74:4 83:9 87:12 88:11
1.you(7) 28:16 51:18 60:9 69:4 71:12	referenced(3) 12:15 52:19 91:17	result(2) 10:4 50:7	
72:14 74:16	referred(1) 72:10	results(1) 48:3	says(17) 14:21 20:17 23:21 23:23 45:2
you're(2) 36:12 89:3	referring(9) 6:6 6:12 12:6 14:9 17:23	retire(4) 44:5 48:7 48:21 54:9	48:11 51:11 54:1 54:21 55:17 63:14
ualify(1) 42:9	24:14 24:18 39:14 61:3	retired(2) 6:2 66:2	63:17 64:16 65:2 65:13 70:16 90:16
question (35) 4:4 4:24 9:18 11:2 12:23		retiree(1) 52:14	 schedule(1) 7:7
15:8 15:12 15:15 24:8 41:5 42:5 43:18	refutes(1) 82:3	retirees(1) 32:15 retirement(76) 7:20 8:1 8:7 20:10 21:1	scheduled(5) 39:3 39:17 42:3 45:24
43:21 43:22 49:13 49:14 55:2 55:15	regarding(6) 10:5 14:23 17:14 44:2	21:14 21:18 26:13 26:16 27:13 29:11	68:16
64:1 64:10 64:11 64:11 64:12 65:10	84:8 88:23	30:2 30:12 30:21 30:23 31:2 31:8 32:4	
75:8 79:16 79:16 80:2 80:5 87:17	regular(1) 5:16	32:10 32:13 32:22 33:13 33:18 40:4	scheduling(1) 58:13
37:19 88:7 88:10 88:17 91:9	regulations(3) 21:4 37:22 56:6	40:12 40:13 40:17 40:20 41:8 42:7	school(1) 11:20
arrestion od/1) 40:4	rejected(1) 59:10	42:15 43:9 44:20 49:21 49:22 49:23	scrutinized(1) 29:14
questioned(1) 49:4 questioning(3) 57:7 84:7 84:16	related(12) 7:6 19:9 44:23 54:7 59:1	50:1 50:19 50:21 51:13 56:3 56:5 57:9	scrutinizing(3) 29:11 30:12 31:14
ruestions(11) 19:21 38:14 52:4 52:6	59:10 67:16 83:4 85:20 85:21 86:9	57:12 57:12 59:22 62:12 66:18 69:7	seal(1) 95:19
53:9 54:18 54:20 55:13 84:17 93:13	88:19	69:8 69:9 70:24 72:20 72:21 75:13 177:13 78:3 79:4 79:21 81:11 81:23	seat(2) 76:4 76:8
3:19	relates(1) 19:22	82:10 82:19 83:14 84:1 84:9 85:16	seats(3) 75:22 76:6 76:7
juick(2) 29:18 51:21	relating(2) 39:3 84:16	85:17 86:2 86:11 86:21 87:3 88:17	second(11) 6:15 6:16 23:20 28:14
uincy(1) 2:15	relation(1) 89:13	88:22 89:9 90:11	38:12 40:3 46:2 68:6 80:16 90:3 90:1:
ruinn(2) 19:23 20:11	relationship(3) 20:6 71:5 76:1		secret(1) 35:7
uite(1) 54:12		retract(1) 13:19	secretary(2) 69:2 75:23
-15s(1) 16:8	74:17 75:10 77:9 86:20 88:17	retracted(1) 13:22	section(2) 54:1 54:21
aised(1) 57:8	malaga (2) 94.15 94.21	retroactively(4) 50:6 57:13 59:11 61:8	sector(1) 26:16
an(2) 59:7 77:24	release(2) 84:15 84:21 released(1) 84:22	review(5) 12:20 13:19 14:17 54:6 54:17	seeing(1) 48:1
ead(4) 4:6 43:4 55:10 93:9	relevancy(1) 84:22	revieweu(1) 34:15	seminar(1) 42:6
ead:	l	reviews(1) 13:1	seminars(3) 31:7 32:4 32:13
T.10 2T.10 2T.12 2T.66 2T.60 2T.60	relief(1) 41:12	revisit(1) 92:2	send(6) 23:23 24:3 24:8 38:24 57:5
4:31 94:34 94:37 94:40 94:43	rely(2) 12:8 17:12	revisiting(1) 53:3 richard(1) 2:12	65:17
	1 22 22	mino(1) 22:10	A
	1/11/20 4 7	widianInd(1) 20.17	sense(2) 7:16 30:9
	remember(24) 8:3 9:11 15:7 15:8 18:1		sent(8) 24:1 25:8 45:16 50:19 50:20
	22:10 28:11 28:19 28:24 33:21 34:13	15:14 15:14 18:4 19:16 24:15 25:5	51:23 52:6 58:6
eads:	34:15 36:2 36:4 39:7 46:10 46:21 57:3	25:10 26:8 29:9 35:10 46:3 46:11 47:4	sanarata(2) 26:0 26:12 26:14
94:18 94:21 94:24 94:27 94:30 94:33	60:16 67:19 70:14 71:4 74:19 75:22	17.4 17.9 17.0 10.2 10.12 10.21 74.21	separate(3) 36:9 36:13 36:14 september(14) 3:18 3:27 23:8 23:12
4:36 94:39 94:42	V/0\ 0.4.55.54.55	56:1 56:12 56:20 60:12 65:1 66:10	23:18 23:21 50:11 51:2 51:12 51:20
	removed(3) 34:18 34:19 34:21	11.22 12.24 13.3 13.0 13.0 60.9 63.3	56:21 60:16 60:24 66:18
andr/(1) 72-24	repeat(1) 5:1	70.21 71.14	
eady(1) 73:24	repercussions(1) 49:1	risking(1) 59:17	sergeant(5) 6:24 7:13 57:22 81:4 81:10
eal(1) 79:6	rephrase(1) 64:12	room(1) 3:0	serious(1) 19:21
		rooney(15) 21:11 62:15 62:23 64:19	serve(3) 8:7 55:19 56:19
	- ` `	03.7 03:9 03:10 03:20 00:2 07:1 67:3	served(3) 7:19 7:24 56:22
	-1	107.0 U7.12 U7.10 UA:12	services(1) 8:13
eason(5) 5:2 7:11 9:21 13:14 45:20	reporter(3) 1:43 95:4 95:22		serving(1) 8:8
3.1	renorter noteword) 1.70		3 ()
easoning(1) 27:7		run(4) 26:19 31:5 59:4 76:17	

Word Page:Line	Word Page:Line	Word Page:Line	Word Page:Line
session(16) 3:40 15:19 83:15 83:18	something(18) 5:1 21:12 25:17 30:15	substantial(1) 31:24	that's(29) 15:12 18:4 21:6 24:18 25:21
84:2 84:9 84:12 84:13 87:6 87:22 88:4 88:5 88:14 89:15 91:4 91:5	30:19 35:11 42:14 46:20 49:13 59:2 63:24 68:19 75:18 78:11 87:5 89:10	such(1) 7:6	36:15 37:22 38:20 42:14 45:18 47:4
00.5 00.14 05.15 51.4 51.5	89:20 91:12	sue(1) 66:6	50:5 50:7 55:11 61:16 63:2 64:17 68:4 74:23 78:12 83:7 84:12 84:22 86:18
set(4) 12:7 14:21 17:11 95:18		suffering(3) 29:1 69:15 69:18 suffers(1) 63:15	87:16 91:9 91:17 92:4 92:4
several(3) 11:22 35:15 37:23	sometime(5) 40:17 42:5 64:13 67:20	suit(5) 35:8 36:23 36:24 37:3 70:20	31.5 31.1 32.1 32.1
severe(1) 87:23	75:20	suite(3) 1:35 2:8 95:13	their(19) 7:5 7:17 14:7 15:19 15:19
severity(1) 21:12	gametimes(5) 7:12 7:12 11:24 27:7 22:		20:16 21:23 27:4 27:16 35:24 40:20
shake(1) 74:9 shall(4) 4:4 4:5 4:6 4:9	sometimes(5) 7:13 7:13 11:24 27:7 32: somewhere(3) 9:12 28:22 31:23	71:8 71:12 71:16 85:16	42:7 52:7 58:4 58:19 59:11 59:17 59:24 89:1
sheet(2) 93:17 94:1	sorry(11) 10:1 12:14 38:17 51:19 53:22 63:8 73:4 73:16 76:18 80:14 90:21		33.24 63.1
shift(12) 6:19 6:23 7:1 7:4 7:5 11:22	63:8 73:4 73:16 76:18 80:14 90:21	supervisor(5) 6:21 7:1 7:15 81:4 81:6	themselves(1) 56:9
26:12 26:20 28:5 28:5 35:13 81:6		supervisor's(1) 6.21 7.11 7.13 81.4 81.6 supervisor's(1) 6.19	there's(17) 5:2 7:22 14:6 25:13 26:4
	speak(12) 5:3 17:6 17:6 47:18 48:8	supervisors(1) 7:15	31:21 31:22 32:18 42:24 43:10 43:16
shooter(1) 37:8	48:22 62:7 68:19 73:12 73:13 88:3 88:14	supplement(1) 65:2	43:18 58:5 58:20 63:18 81:24 84:13
shooting(1) 35:14 short(2) 26:19 44:9	speaking(3) 33:5 33:5 63:13	supplemental(1) 64:15	therefore(1) 84:15
should(19) 28:13 46:1 84:18 87:2 87:3	specific(5) 28:6 31:18 31:19 56:6 63:15	supplementation(3) 65:5 65:14 65:17	therein(2) 93:14 93:19
94:4 94:7 94:10 94:13 94:16 94:19	specifically(9) 6:10 10:16 16:21 17:2	supplied(1) 44:12	thereto(1) 84:16
94:22 94:25 94:28 94:31 94:34 94:37	17:5 21:4 33:6 58:5 84:24	supply(1) 44:19 supporting(1) 78:1	they'd(4) 27:1 27:2 27:23 27:24
94:40 94:43	specify(1) 29:4	supposed(6) 7:16 30:6 34:16 34:17	they're(10) 20:4 20:5 20:6 27:8 29:15
show(13) 6:8 29:3 39:1 45:2 50:10	speed(1) 41:23	34:18 84:11	29:16 29:18 38:21 52:8 58:22
52:18 59:14 60:11 61:12 62:16 70:3	spells(2) 11:23 11:24		thing(5) 13:7 29:20 37:5 73:18 73:19
83:12 90:6	spoke(14) 21:10 21:14 39:16 46:19	sure(3) 18:15 26:7 28:17	things(11) 7:12 11:21 11:24 31:15
showed(2) 63:12 66:7	61:4 62:22 65:20 67:2 67:9 68:12	surgeon(1) 39:16	41:23 42:1 43:16 49:10 60:23 63:13
showing(3) 18:8 51:10 85:12	68:18 74:6 74:7 82:15	surgery(4) 39:3 39:13 39:13 39:17 surrounding(1) 88:4	78:2
sic(1) 64:17	spring(3) 32:6 41:18 69:21	suspend(1) 91:24	think(17) 9:4 10:13 11:4 14:11 18:16 25:15 34:3 34:24 46:19 48:2 52:19
sick(29) 10:5 13:1 13:6 13:7 13:12 13:21 13:24 46:1 46:3 46:5 46:5 46:7	stacks(1) 29:7	suspended(1) 92:6	53:6 56:21 60:20 72:10 81:2 87:7
	stairs(1) 39:11	suspension(1) 81:15	
48:17 48:19 49:1 49:20 49:24 57:11	standard(2) 37:4 50:20	swat(2) 37:2 37:3	thinks(1) 63:19
	standing(3) 36:14 43:18 43:22	swear(2) 78:13 78:14	third(1) 2:14
1 4 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	start(1) 6:4	sworn(2) 4:13 95:8	thomas(6) 1:9 1:21 3:3 4:11 93:8 95:7
	started(4) 4:17 22:12 22:14 60:14	sympathetic(1) 27:3 symptoms(2) 11:20 11:23	thorough(1) 53:14 though(1) 53:11
-1	starting(2) 24:24 46:4 starts(1) 29:23	system(5) 27:13 30:2 32:10 32:13 56:3	
1 .**	state(12) 32:5 32:8 35:20 36:20 42:18	systems(3) 24:6 40:12 40:13	43:6 73:7 78:10 78:10
signing(4) 4:8 77:9 77:17 78:16	48:23 52:7 52:7 58:7 59:8 62:10 86:14		
silverfine(58) 2:21 3:5 4:15 5:7 5:11		take(8) 5:16 5:19 12:2 24:15 31:3	threaten(1) 69:7
	stated(3) 52:17 81:22 82:21	38:18 55:1 63:16	three(6) 18:15 20:3 34:4 34:5 52:3 three-page(1) 72:11
44.10 45.0 45.54 50.04 51.5 51.0	statehouse(1) 32:9 statement(2) 69:12 82:22	taken(7) 1:25 44:9 63:23 86:17 93:10	through(10) 15:11 18:3 20:20 32:9
52:20 53:4 53:8 53:12 53:17 53:20	statements(1) 81:21	95:11 95:17	42:18 49:11 53:10 65:3 76:21 93:9
55:22 57:6 61:23 62:4 64:8 64:9 70:4	states(8) 1:3 12:7 13:3 17:11 32:16		
70:10 71:24 72:5 80:7 80:15 80:18 80:19 83:13 83:23 84:1 84:19 85:11	49:23 86:14 93:3	takes(1) 58:8	throw(3) 35:7 74:1 78:8
97-7 97-15 97-10 00-15 00-2 00-10	atatio= (9) 20.12 (5.20 (7.24 (0.11	taking(3) 11:12 58:14 92:5 talk(4) 37:18 43:23 60:9 62:20	throwing(1) 78:24 thumb(1) 81:18
30.2 30.3 31.24	station(8) 20:13 65:20 67:24 68:11 68:13 74:20 74:22 76:16	talked(7) 34:7 56:24 57:4 62:20 64:13	till(8) 22:3 38:2 38:11 49:5 50:1
Similar(1) 00.22	7,22 7,22	65:18 66:10	58:23 59:15
	status(2) 5:22 62:18]
		talking(3) 29:4 34:9 48:5	time(89) 4:5 4:6 5:14 5:18 5:23 6:4
,		taped(1) 82:8	7:3 7:9 8:17 8:20 10:5 13:2 13:12 13:21 13:24 22:11 24:7 24:14 24:20
sir(1) 89:5		team(3) 36:20 37:2 37:3 tell(8) 12:4 26:24 40:23 65:2 72:24	24:23 24:24 25:1 26:9 27:20 27:24
sit(5) 8:22 55:24 58:13 62:15 68:16		75:5 79:3 81:10	28:7 28:8 30:2 32:3 33:7 34:7 34:9
sits(1) 81:19	stenographer(1) 80:7		36:21 36:22 41:17 42:3 42:10 45:24
(cio(3) 40·1 40·19 42·7		tening(+) 10.23 10.24 15.1 15.1	46:1 46:3 46:3 46:5 46:6 46:7 46:14 46:16 46:23 46:23 47:12 47:13 47:13
ebill(1) 05-11		temporarity(2) 0.10 0.22	47:15 47:17 48:9 48:9 48:14 48:17
el/in(1) 28-11	* ``	71.10 71.21	48:17 48:19 48:20 49:19 49:20 50:1
skippy(1) 45:19	stomach(2) 39:12 39:19 stop(2) 14:4 66:10	71.19 71.21	53:10 54:24 56:15 57:1 57:11 57:14
some(29) 4:20 6:10 14:4 15:11 15:18		tension(1) 69:15	58:1 58:8 58:10 58:17 58:21 59:4 59:7
17:8 19:21 21:16 27:2 27:5 28:3 34:8	street(5) 1:33 2:8 2:13 78:8 95:13	term(1) 56:12	59:12 60:24 61:6 63:12 63:15 66:11
10.4 .00 [4 .00][4 .00][7 40][9 47]0	stress(3) 69:15 69:19 70:1	terms(2) 37:8 84:10	92:3
64:15 71:10 75:10 81:8 92:2	31.110(1) 110 50.20 57.0 57.0	testified(2) 11:5 14:12	times(7) 11:18 11:22 12:2 13:14 60:4
[8		testify(4) 4:14 38:3 95:8 95:9	60:5 79:7
10.10 01.5	(2) 57.12	testimony(2) 3:3 95:11 than(8) 14:12 25:14 37:1 52:13 66:17	to (1) 30:20
	3444(1) 1010 D 1.11 05.10 05.12	50 44 OC = 00 4	to.(1) 30:20 today(6) 5:15 38:2 72:10 76:11 91:18
30111011011(2) 1015 00111	subject(3) 10:24 37:21 84:23 submit(1) 56:5		92:1
Bomeone(5) 12.11 10.17 50.5	submitted(2) 56:4 66:16	thank(2) 26:7 53:23	
Someone S(1) OS.1	submitting(1) 63:10		together(2) 32:19 58:10
	subsequent(1) 54:24		
Page: 9			00/04/06 46:02:29

08/01/06 16:23:33

Word Page:Line	Tuge: Line	Word Page:Line	Word Page:Line
told(13) 10:24 17:16 34:24 67:6 67:8 67:11 67:12 73:14 73:20 73:22 78:5		week(5) 37:15 42:11 42:13 42:21 42:2	21 woman(1) 81:23
83:7 90:20:	undertaken(1) 87:20	week's(1) 37:16	word(3) 27:17 30:10 82:16
30.20	undertaking(1) 32:12	welcome(1) 38:20	words(12) 9:20 25:13 42:15 64:14
tom(1) 21:15	undertook(1) 87:16	well(28) 6:20 7:7 10:9 11:10 12:22	72:24 74:4 79:3 79:20 R1·12 R2·20
took(5) 8:21 59:17 67:16 86:6 88:8	unfunded(1) 32:14 uniformed(2) 36:18 36:19	14:7 19:20 21:5 22:9 23:1 26:1 26:21	
toomey(1) 60:18	union(3) 14:22 15:2 16:23	39:8 41:20 46:9 50:8 54:17 59:6 63:3 63:16 63:18 69:22 78:6 78:9 80:11	
top(1) 91:8	unit(3) 36:13 36:14 88:5	87:7 87:11 89:19	work(10) 11:19 11:20 29:11 29:15 30:12 31:2 32:18 33:8 36:24 37:14
totally(1) 43:4	united(2) 1:3 93:3		
touch(1) 82:11	unnecessary(1) 29:20	went(29) 11:19 13:7 19:18 20:20 21:2	1 worked(4) 6:21 8:6 32:9 71:20
towards(1) 24:23 town(45) 1:13 8:5 8:6 8:19 10:4 14:1	unsigned(1) 84:12	124.4 23.24 20.12 20.10 28:9 39:10	working(8) 33:6 39:18 45:20 45:21
17:15 19:6 19:7 19:8 19:20 20:9 20:	3 until(4) 4:5 4:6 46:6 91:1	39:15 46:6 46:8 46:19 46:22 47:3	46:24 46:24 74:19 74:20
20:17 20:17 20:18 20:19 21:16 26:11	abcoung(1) 14:12	47:11 49:11 53:5 53:7 53:10 64:19 64:19 68:11 68:14 76:22 76:24 82:17	
28:16 44:23 48:11 49:24 50:6 50:18	upon(4) 64:9 84:22 84:24 95:9	01.12 00.14 00.14 70.22 70.24 82.17	works(1) 71:6
55:7 55:7 56:2 56:3 56:4 56:6 57:10	upset(4) 27:2 27:6 78:19 78:21	were(96) 5:23 6:5 6:6 6:22 7:5 8:20	world(2) 61:7 61:8
57:13 58:3 58:23 60:3 60:17 61:2	use(12) 13:1 13:21 14:5 16:7 45:18 48:17 49:24 59:4 60:21 60:22 83:4	10:1 10:24 10:24 11:6 11:7 11:8 11:1	would(64) 6:23 7:7 7:8 7:12 9:2 9:16
65:23 66:6 68:10 77:20 77:22 77:23 79:17	185:2 59:4 00:21 00:22 83:4		13:13 14:2 14:17 18:17 21:1 21:8
town's(1) 59:3	used(7) 13:3 13:4 13:5 13:6 13:24	14:9 15:10 15:11 16:4 16:15 19:21	24:24 25:7 26:15 26:18 26:19 26:24
towns(1) 17:8	45:18 57:11	20:22 20:24 21:18 21:22 22:17 22:23 23:13 23:17 24:14 24:18 25:9 27:3	28:5 29:15 30:1 30:3 30:4 30:18 32:2:
tracked(1) 60:12		127.6 27.12 20.1 20.10 20.17 20.21	33:2 33:6 33:7 33:8 33:10 34:3 34:4
tracking(1) 58:8	uses(1) 58:21	33:17 35:9 35:15 35:22 36:4 36:7 36:8	34:23 35:6 40:4 40:10 45:22 47:18
training(2) 15:18 63:17	using(2) 46:7 58:15	36:12 36:18 36:18 37:4 37:23 37:24	59:4 59:9 59:11 60:11 62:18 65:24
transcript(4) 4:7 4:9 93:10 95:9	vacation(16) 19:24 20:11 24:14 24:20	38:10 38:19 43:3 46:7 46:13 46:23	66:2 66:21 78:23 81:14 84:4 86:17
transcription(2) 93:13 93:18	24:22 24:22 45:24 46:3 46:11 46:14	47:11 47:21 47:21 52:4 52:6 52:13	107.4 07.5
transpired(1) 70:19	46:23 47:13 47:17 48:9 48:17 49:19	52:24 56:9 58:6 58:8 58:15 59:3 59:13 59:14 59:24 61:1 63:10 63:13 66:7	3
treasurer(1) 8:13	vacation/sick(1) 57:1	73:7 74:17 75:11 76:6 76:13 77:3 77:6	wouldn't(3) 29:21 30:8 59:16
treated(3) 10:6 52:13 69:16	vandalism(1) 7:11	78:10 78:19 82:4 83:18 85:18 86:10	Write(1) 17:19
treating(1) 25:20	varies(1) 31:9	89:9 90:12	writing(1) 10:20
trial(2) 4:5 4:6	various(1) 7:10		written(6) 15:7 19:19 51:20 89:6 89:7
trick(1) 79:14	verbalize(1) 9:20	what(59) 5:13 6:3 7:5 7:19 8:6 8:24	91:18
tried(3) 17:6 17:8 59:20 triggering(1) 57:23	verbally(1) 10:20	11:6 12:15 14:8 14:12 15:12 16:5 16:9	wrote(10) 15:12 16:15 17:17 19:5
trip(1) 32:21	versus(2) 57:20 57:22	16:14 16:18 16:20 19:11 23:3 24:5 24:18 25:6 25:11 25:16 26:6 29:4	22:11 23:3 47:23 48:13 89:18 91:1
trips(2) 31:3 33:18	via(2) 33:1 47:24	121,12 22,4 24.1 24.12 25 24 24 25	10.13 05.10 51.1
true(3) 93:12 93:17 95:10	viella(6) 77:21 78:12 78:13 78:16 79:3	[40:10 41:7 41:12 42:4 49:16 57:22	yeah(11) 6:14 39:6 47:2 47:5 47:5
trump(1) 86:6	80:20	58:4 58:14 59:24 61:4 62:9 62:16	55:14 73:5 90:10 90:10 91:10 91:10
trustee(1) 42:2	view(2) 42:2 89:1	64:18 66:19 70:18 70:23 72:24 73:21	(0) 45 4 4 4 4
truth(1) 79:7	violation(1) 35:5	76:1 76:15 79:8 86:1 86:2 87:12 87:13 88:11 88:17 89:12	year(8) 13:4 14:2 14:5 24:24 31:8 32:4 34:14 75:15
try(2) 30:20 79:16	volume(1) 79:24	08.11 00.17 09.12	34.14 /3:13
trying(14) 16:14 29:8 30:15 31:13	voluntary(1) 18:10	what's(9) 8:19 25:2 45:15 53:4 53:18	yearly(1) 12:24
36:24 53:13 57:10 59:2 59:13 63:24 64:1 79:14 80:12 83:11	volunteer(1) 27:4	60:19 62:5 72:6 90:6	years(20) 7:23 8:2 20:22 28:7 32:11
04.1 75.14 80.12 85.11	volunteered(1) 91:12		[34:1 34:4 34:5 34:12 42:13 42:19 43:2
turnaround(1) 51:21	vote(2) 20:17 84:14	where's(1) 9:7	43:6 56:19 58:14 60:5 60:9 71:7 71:19
turned(3) 29:17 73:14 73:19	wait(2) 50:4 64:5	wherein(1) 81:22	71:21
turner(1) 66:7	waiting(1) 57:11	whereof(1) 95:18	
turns(1) 58:9	waived(1) 4:9 walked(2) 21:17 73:14	whereupon(13) 18:22 23:11 39:22	yesterday(1) 54:10 yet(1) 59:8
twelve(2) 13:3 14:1	wall(1) 37:19	45:10 51:1 52:23 61:24 70:6 72:1 83:17 85:7 89:22 92:5	you'd(2) 18:2 29:3
twenty-three(1) 13:4	want(12) 17:24 18:15 19:13 26:6 26:10		you'll(2) 53:13 72:11
twice(1) 13:21	36:21 41:4 42:17 43:20 55:15 59:24	whether(6) 17:1 75:8 84:20 87:4 87:19	you're(30) 17:22 29:4 31:13 34:1 35:9
two(20) 6:22 8:21 10:6 11:21 11:23 15:10 26:19 27:1 29:22 34:5 43:16	78:23	88:8	36:14 37:20 37:21 38:20 39:14 41:9
47:2 63:13 63:21 72:23 76:6 76:7 77:5	wanted(5) 48:23 55:10 70:18 71:2	10 (5) 0.5	41:10 43:22 47:3 47:7 53:15 56:11
84:22 87:22	wanting(1) 10:17	while(5) 8:7 8:21 19:2 33:17 57:11	61:3 73:5 73:6 73:6 78:1 78:6 78:6
1	wants(2) 68:2 73:13	who(19) 6:24 7:1 7:1 7:24 8:6 8:16 13:1 15:22 19:6 30:1 37:24 39:16	78:9 79:15 79:15 87:13 87:21 89:8
two-page(1) 72:12	warnock(2) 73:10 74:1	55:24 59:4 60:16 73:16 75:21 82:2	you've(15) 7:20 8:7 12:15 14:12 25:7
type(4) 11:23 13:7 50:1 56:8	washington(1) 33:19	82:3	25:16 32:3 38:7 54:13 67:16 71:17
types(1) 7:12	wasn't(20) 10:2 16:13 21:23 29:22 30:2 34:17 36:6 36:11 45:20 45:21 46:9	who's(3) 9:5 41:19 76:18	71:18 80:1 80:9 90:7
uh-huh(1) 12:14	46:24 55:20 56:15 63:19 69:17 74:19	whole(7) 29:20 32:2 57:7 71:13 74:6	,
ultimately(1) 49:20	74:22 76:15 78:21	80:2 82:16	yours(1) 35:16
unanimous(2) 52:2 62:14 unconscious(1) 63:23		m-h(4) 18-20, 22 5 24 5 == 1	yourself(8) 7:6 7:16 9:21 24:13 39:2
undated(1) 84:13	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	l	43:8 65:16 73:23
under(17) 10:8 10:9 11:9 11:10 15:13	we'll(14) 4:20 4:20 5:5 18:5 19:2 23:8	wide(1) 43:7	zazzarino(1) 39:16
34:17 36:2 50:22 52:7 52:8 69:22	23:10 52:22 71:24 83:13 83:15 85:4		zip(1) 37:5
69:24 71:8 78:6 78:24 81:17 84:10	86:1 89:20	will(4) 21:5 38:23 58:23 90:17 within(2) 4:7 90:18	
	we're(4) 4:18 31:10 61:8 92:1	without(4) 20:22 48:24 58:18 58:22	ĺ
undergoing(2) 25:10 74:17	we've(6) 6:9 25:6 29:7 42:11 65:18	witness(25) 1:23 4:6 4:11 6:13 24:16	
junuerstanu(10) 4.24 11:4 26:10 29:9	wear(3) 36:20 36:23 37:3	26:3 39:5 44:6 45:4 45:17 50:13 53:5	
	webber(1) 82:2	53:7 53:15 54:4 61:14 70:13 72:8 80:3	
	wednesday(3) 1:37 93:11 95:14	80:6 80:11 80:13 85:13 90:9 95:18	ĺ
understanding(4) 26:15 26:17 26:23			ļ

08/01/06 16:23:33

EXHIBIT 5

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS | PUBLIC EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT ADMINISTRATION COMMISSION

DOMENIC J. F. RUSSO, Chairman A JOSEPH DENUCCI, Vice Chairman KENNETH J. DONNELLY | ERIC A. KRISS | JAMES M. MACHADO | DONALD R. MARQUIS

JOSEPH E CONNARTON, Emarine Director

June 3, 2004

JUN 0 9 2004 TOWN MANAGER'S OFFICE PLYAIOUTH MA

Plymouth Retirement Board 11 Lincoln Street Plymouth, MA 02360

Dear Retirement Board Members:

I am in receipt of a letter dated May 26, 2004 addressed to the Board from Captain Botieri regarding the conduct of Board Member Kelley. The assertions in the letter are very serious, and if supported could have an actual or perceived impact on the ability of the Plymouth Retirement Board to act fairly or to function in accordance with the provisions of G.L. c. 32, and in accordance with the pertinent regulations, most specifically 840 CMR 17.00.

We expect that the Board will immediately investigate the matters discussed in the letter, and advise the Commission within 30 days of the Board's findings and the outcome of investigation.

It is vital that Retirement Boards and the individual Board Members not only act in a fair and prudent manner in the exclusive interest of the System's members and beneficiaries, but also be perceived by others as acting in a fair and prudent manner. The Board is directed to act on this matter as soon as possible, but no later than 30 days from the receipt of this letter.

If you have questions, please contact me.

Sincerely.

Joseph E. Connarton **Executive Director**

supp 9. Connerson

JEC/sfc p: liegal/bphillips/plymouth re kelley.doc

CC:

Captain Michael E. Botieri Attorney General Thomas Reilly State Ethics Commission Plymouth Town Manager, Pamela Nolan Town of Plymouth Board of Selectmen



EXHIBIT 6

Case 1:05-cv-10596-MBB Document 37-8 Filed 10/30/2006 Page 2 of 6 Vestlaw Attached Printing Summary Report for HARRIS, KRISTIN T 5566283

Your Search:

"executive session" /p privilege

Date/Time of Request:

Wednesday, August 16, 2006 08:28:00 Central

Client Identifier:

KELLEY

→ atabase:

w csma cs

Citation Text:

Not Reported in N.E.2d

Lines:

326

Documents:

1

Irmages:

0

The material accompanying this summary is subject to copyright. Usage is governed by contract with Thomson, West and their affiliates.



Not Reported in N.E.2d

Not Reported in N.E.2d, 12 Mass.L.Rptr. 154, 2000 WL 1473038 (Mass.Super.)

(Cite as: Not Reported in N.E.2d)

Н

Superior Court of Massachusetts. Peter J. PORCARO and another, FN1

FN1. Carolyn Porcaro

v.

The TOWN OF HOPKINTON and others. FN2

<u>FN2.</u> Richard Bowker, individually and in his official capacity; and Mary E. Harrington, individually and in her official capacity.

No. 965438.

July 18, 2000.

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION AND ORDER ON PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO COMPEL

BOTSFORD.

*1 The plaintiffs in this action challenge actions taken by the defendant Town of Hopkinton (the town) and certain of its officials which the plaintiffs claim purposefully deprived them of their civil rights in relation to the development of building lots they own in the town. The principal focus of the plaintiffs' complaint is the persistent refusal of the defendants to permit the issuance of building permits for the lots, which has allegedly prevented their development or sale.

Discovery has taken place over a long period of time, and has involved, *inter alia*, numerous depositions of town officials. The plaintiffs have moved to compel further deposition testimony from a variety of these officials. They have also moved to compel production of certain documents. The sought-after deposition testimony primarily concerns (1) conversations between or among the individual officials and an attorney serving as town counsel, and (2) the contents of an executive session of the town's board of selectmen held October 31, 1995. The documents at issue fall into a number of different categories. The two aspects of the plaintiffs' motion are discussed separately below.

I. Motion to Compel Testimony

A. Laurence Faiman

1. Laurence Faiman was serving as counsel for the town at times relevant to this action. The plaintiffs wish to question Mr. Faiman about any conversations he may have had with the building inspector in 1992 concerning the plaintiffs' applications for building permits. (Motion to Compel, ¶¶ A.1., A.2.) They argue that the defendants have waived any attorney-client privilege that might otherwise attach to these conversations PN3 by virtue of the fact that two letters which Mr. Faiman wrote to town officials have been made public. The defendants disagree.

FN3. The question whether a public client is entitled to the benefit of an attorney-client privilege is not, perhaps, fully established. See <u>District Attorney for the Plymouth District v. Board of Selectmen of Middleborough</u>, 395 Mass. 629, 632 n. 4 (1985). However, I assume that the privilege does exist. See Proposed Mass R.Evid.501 (1980).

Both of the Faiman letters were written in 1995. The first, with a February 1995 date, is addressed to the town's planning board and concerns an apparent request by the plaintiffs for an "approval not required" endorsement of a plan for the lots. See G.L.c. 41, § 81P. The second letter, dated in August, relates to an amendment to the town's zoning bylaw which was enacted in May of 1995, and specifically to the application of the bylaw amendment to the plaintiffs' lots. I un derstand that independently of this lawsuit, officials of the town had made both letters public, by placing them in public files of the town or otherwise. FN4 There is no dispute among the parties that publication of these letters waived the privilege insofar as the letters themselves are concerned, and indeed it appears that Mr. Faiman has been questioned in deposition at some length about the letters and their contents. However, this does not mean that the defendants have waived generally the attorney-client privilege in relation to all matters which touch on town officials' handling of the Porcaros' building permit applications and their lots both before and after the dates of the two letters. The plaintiffs offer no case or other authority that would support such a broad waiver theory, and I have found none; I do not read the decisions in Commonwealth v. Goldman, 395 Mass. 495 (1985), or Commonwealth v. Woodberry, 26 Mass. App.Ct. 636, 639 (1988), cited by the plaintiffs, as reaching this far. Whatever the scope of waiver, it does not encompass the conversations at issue between Mr. Faiman and the building inspector in 1992. Compare Amca Int'l Corp. v. Phipard. 107 F.R.D. 39, 43-44 (D.Mass.1985). Compare also Ploof v. Cornu-Schaab Properties, Inc., 1 Mass.L.Rptr. 292 (1993), 1993 WL 818723 (Mass. Superior Court) (Flannery, J.). Accordingly, the plaintiffs' motion to compel is denied in relation to ¶¶ A.1 and A.2 of the motion.

FN4. If the understanding stated in the text is incorrect, counsel should so inform me.

- *2 2. With respect to ¶ A.3 of the motion to compel, the question that was objected to appears to be substantively connected to the previous question, and substantively connected to the letter discussed on p. 29 of Mr. Faiman's transcript. Accordingly, the motion to compel Mr. Faiman to answer the question is allowed. Cf. <u>Amca Int'l Corp. v. Phipard. supra. 107 F.R.D. at 44</u> (disclosure of memorandum prepared by lawyers waives attorney-client privilege as to group of documents prepared up to the point of disclosure which relate to the same subject as the memorandum).
- 3. The plaintiffs next seek testimony (motion to compel, \P A.4) by Mr. Faiman concerning whether any of the relevant town officials discussed the intent to change the zoning bylaw before the change was made in May 1995. I do not believe that Mr. Faiman's letter of August 15, 1995, concerning the application of that bylaw amendment to the plaintiffs' lots, without more, waives the attorney-client privilege about conversations occurring before the bylaw amendment was enacted. $\frac{FN5}{FN5}$
 - FN5. There is nothing before me to suggest that the defendants take the position in this case that the enactment of the bylaw amendment was based on advice of counsel in whole or in part; if that were the situation, perhaps a waiver would be found. See, e.g., Weil v. Investment/Indicators Research and Mgt., Inc., 647 F.2d 18, 23-25 (9th Cir.1981); Haymes v. Smith, 73 F.R.D. 572, 577 (W.D.N.Y.1976), both cited in the Amca case, Amca Intl. Corp. v. Phipard, 107 F.R.D. 39, 42-43 (D.Mass.1985).
- 4. In ¶¶ A.5 and A.6 of the motion to compel, the plaintiffs want Mr. Faiman to indicate if, after his August 15, 1995, letter, he gave an opinion to any town official regarding whether the agreement for judgment superseded the bylaw amendment. I believe Mr. Faiman could be required to testify about the circumstances, including communications he had with town officials, leading up to the writing of his August 15 letter, and also about communications with town officials that related to the letter and the opinions expressed in it until the letter was disclosed publicly, even if those

communications occurred after the letter was written. See Amca Int'l Corp., supra, 107 F.R.D. at 44. However, the letter does not operate as a general waiver for any otherwise privileged opinion expressed by Mr. Faiman after August 15, 1995, on the subject of the relationship between the agreement for judgment and the bylaw amendment. Accordingly, the motion to compel set out in ¶ A.5 and A.6 should be allowed in part and denied in part.

5. The plaintiffs seek to have Mr. Faiman testify about the discussion between and among those present at the board of se lectmen's executive session held October 31, 1995. FN6 The defendants resist, claiming that the executive session was properly held under G.L.c. 39, § 23B(3), and that the discussions occurring within the executive session are therefore confidential as well as privileged because the session involved consultations between and among town counsel and town of ficials. I disagree with the defendants.

<u>FN6.</u> It appears that the persons present were two of the selectmen, the executive secretary of the board of selectmen, the building inspector and Mr. Faiman.

The Open Meeting Law, <u>G.L.c.</u> 39, § 23B, provides that executive sessions of governmental bodies may be held for only the limited purposes specifically set out in the section. See <u>District Attorney for the Plymouth Dist. v. Board of Selectmen of Middleborough</u>, 395 Mass. 629, 631-632 (1985). See also <u>Pearson v. Board of Health of Chicopee</u>, 402 Mass. 797, 799-800 (1988). Cf. <u>General Elec. Co. v. Department of Envi'l Protection</u>, 429 Mass. 798, 806 (1999). One of the purposes, and the one relied on by the defendants, is:

*3 (3) To discuss strategy with respect to collective bargaining or litigation if an open meeting may have a detrimental effect on the bargaining or litigating position of the governmental body ...

G.L.c. 39, § 23B(3). The defendants argue that as of the date of the meeting, the plaintiffs had brought one lawsuit against the town which had been resolved, and the selectmen were considering taking action that might affect that lawsuit as well as give rise to another suit, and that § 23B(3) has been recognized as applying to discussions of threatened as well as existing litigation. (Town's opposition memorandum, p. 4.) It is true that the courts have included imminently threatened litigation within the scope of § 23B(3). See Doherty v. School Committee of Boston. 386 Mass. 643, 648 (1982) (in the midst of "extensive" pending litigation between the school committee and the teachers union about funding of teachers' salaries, school committee could properly anticipate a legal challenge by union to layoffs of teachers based on limited funding, and executive session to discuss the potential litigation was proper); Perryman v. School Committee of Boston, 17 Mass.App .Ct. 346, 352 (1983) (executive session under § 23B(3) properly called where in open session of school committee's meeting, the committee's attorney advised that plaintiffs would be seeking an injunction against committee within a week based on committee's action). See also District Attorney for the Plymouth Dist. v. Board of Selectmen of Middleborough. supra, 395 Mass. at 632 n. 3. But in this case, the plaintiffs' first suit against the town had been resolved by an agreement for judgment filed in March of 1995, more than six months before the meeting at issue, and nothing in the record indicates that as of October 31, 1995, the plaintiffs were threatening, suggesting or even contemplating any other action against the town. That the plaintiffs did file a suit against the town months later in response to the defendants' action of revoking the building permits-a course of action proposed and voted on at the October 31, 1995, meeting-did not make the litigation imminently or obviously threatened as of October 31. The Open Meeting Law serves an important public purpose, and its exceptions are to be construed according to their terms. See id. at 632-633. The defendants' claim that § 23B(3) authorized the executive session held on October 31, if accepted, would stretch the exception beyond reasonable limits.

Moreover, the record indicates that the defendants violated the procedural requirements of \S 23B for holding an executive session. The section provides:

No executive session shall be held until the governmental body has first convened in an open session for which notice has been given, a majority of the members have voted to go into executive session and the vote of each member is recorded on a roll call vote and entered into the minutes, the presiding officer has cited the purpose for an executive session, and the presiding officer has stated before the executive session if the governmental body will reconvene after the executive session.

*4 G.L.c. 39, § 23B, third paragraph. It appears that the executive session on October 31, 1995, was convened and held at 7:00 p.m., one half hour before the scheduled open meeting of the selectmen began. If my reading of the records is correct, such a procedure plainly violated the quoted statutory provisions. See <u>Pearson v. Board of Health of Chicopee.</u> <u>supra.</u> 402 Mass. at 798-99, 802-03 (closed meeting of board of health which was conducted in the hour before scheduled meeting found by trial judge to be an "open, flagrant and serious" violation of § 23B).

It light of the substantive and procedural flaws attending the executive session convened on October 31, 1995, I conclude that the defendants are not justified in claiming the matters discussed in the session and the session's minutes are exempt under § 23B(3) from discovery in this lawsuit. The separate but related question the defendants began to raise, however, is whether the contents of the discussion at the meeting are protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege because Mr. Faiman was present throughout the session. The answer is no. I have concluded that the defendants could not properly meet in executive session on October 31, 1995, to discuss a proposal to revoke the plaintiffs' building permits; the proposal and the vote should have been presented as part of the selectmen's scheduled open meeting. The defendants are not entitled to make an end-run around the requirements of the Open Meeting Law by as serting attorney-client privilege. This appears to be the point of District Attorney for the Plymouth Dist. v. Board of Selectmen of Middleborough, supra, 395 Mass. at 632. As that case states, the Open Meeting Law does not contain an additional, implied exception to open meetings for discussions between a board and its attorney. The plaintiffs here are entitled to question any of the participants, including Mr. Faiman, about what transpired at the October 31, 1995, executive session. FN7 The motion to compel set out in ¶ A.7 will be allowed.

FN7. In addition, the plaintiffs are entitled to discovery of the executive session minutes. See p. 10 below.

- 6. The plaintiffs want Mr. Faiman to testify about conversations he had with the defendant Bowker after the October 31, 1995, meeting. I agree with the defendants that no waiver of the attorney-client privilege has occurred with respect to those conversations. Since the plaintiffs appear to accept that the conversations would be privileged except for waiver, the motion to compel set out in ¶ A.8 will be denied.
- 7. The remaining paragraphs of the plaintiffs' motion to compel testimony from Mr. Faiman will also be denied, because there is no evidence of waiver of attorney-client **privilege** relating to the conversations and topics addressed in those paragraphs, except insofar as any of these matters were discussed during the October 31, 1995, **executive session**. As indicated above, the plaintiffs are entitled to inquire about all that was said during that session.

B. Mary E. Harrington

- 1. The plaintiffs seek to have Mary Harrington answer whether she ever discussed the effect of the zoning bylaw amendment with town counsel in 1995. For the reasons discussed above in connection with Laurence Faiman, I conclude that the plaintiffs would be entitled to ask Harrington about any conversation she had with town counsel that is connected with his August 15, 1995, opinion letter on the amendment-that is, any conversation preceding that letter which related to a request for an opinion, or any conversation about the letter that occurred after its issuance but before it was disclosed. I also conclude that the plaintiffs may inquire about whether Harrington discussed the effect of the bylaw amendment during the October 31, 1995, meeting. However, any other privileged conversations Harrington had with town counsel on this subject in 1995 need not be disclosed. The motion to compel in ¶B.1 will be allowed in part and denied in part, consistent with this paragraph.
- *5 2. Again, for the reasons discussed above (see pp. 4-7), the plaintiffs are entitled to inquire about discussions that took place at the October 31 meeting. The motion to compel set out in ¶ B.2 will be allowed.

C. Theodore Kozak

The plaintiffs are entitled to ask Kozak about the contents of the October 31, 1995, executive session, for the reasons discussed above. They are also entitled to ask him about his conversation in a car going to Boston with Mr. Faiman on the topic of Mr. Faiman's opinion letter of August 15, 1995. The basis for this conclusion is that the defendants have not established, based on Kozak's testimony about this conversation, that it was a privileged attorney-client communication. See *Matter of the Reorganization of Elec. Mut. Liability Ins. Co. Ltd. (Bermuda)*, 425 Mass. 419, 421 (1997). It appears that other conversations alluded to in the plaintiffs' motion to compel were privileged, and Kozak will not be required to answer questions about them.

D. Richard Bowker, Sr.

The plaintiffs are entitled to ask Bowker about the contents of the October 31, 1995, executive session, for the reasons

F. Maureen Dwinnell

The plaintiffs are entitled to ask Dwinnell about the contents of the October 31, 1995, executive session.

II. Motion to Compel Production of Documents

A. Requested Documents Withheld by the Defendants on Grounds of Privilege

The plaintiffs seek minutes and documents relating to the board of selectmen meeting of November 15, 1994, and the zoning board of appeals meeting of November 16, 1994. It appears that no claim of **privilege** is asserted with respect to these meetings, but there is a dispute about whether there even was a meeting on November 15, 1994. The defendants have agreed to continue to search for records of these meetings, if held, and if the records are found, they are to be produced. For reasons discussed above in connection with Laurence Faiman, the minutes of the October 31, 1995, **executive session** of the board of selectmen are to be produced.

The plaintiffs do not discuss in their memorandum in support of the motion to compel any request for correspondence between State building inspector James Barry and the town. The defendants state the plaintiffs never made such a request. The motion to compel relating to these records will be denied as waived.

Finally, the plaintiffs seek production of correspondence which the defendants have refused to turn over on grounds of attomey-client and work product privilege. With the exception of the October 31, 1995, minutes, I believe the defendants are entitled to claim privilege for the listed documents, and their production will not be ordered.

B. Documents Requested During the Course of Depositions

The defendants object to the production of documents that were discussed and requested during the course of depositions because they claim the plaintiffs did not comply with <u>Superior Court Rule 9C</u>. In the circumstances, where the documents were requested and the commitment to produce them was made during depositions, the defendants should produce them.

ORDER

*6 For the foregoing reasons, it is *ordered* that the plaintiffs' motion to compel deposition testimony be *allowed* with respect to Paragraph I. A.3, A.5 and A.6 to the extent discussed in this memorandum of decision, and A.7; Paragraph I. B.1, to the extent discussed in this memorandum of decision, and B.2; Paragraph I.C.1, C.2, and C.3 to the extent discussed in this memorandum of decision; Paragraph D.1 and D.2; and Paragraph E.1 of the motion. The motion to compel deposition testimony is otherwise *denied*. It is further *ordered* that the plaintiffs' motion to compel the production of documents is *allowed* with respect to Paragraph IIC, and *denied* with respect to Paragraph IID and F. The motion to compel production of documents is otherwise *allowed in part and denied in part*, consistent with the discussion in this memorandum of decision.

Mass.Super.,2000.

Porcaro v. Town of Hopkinton

Not Reported in N.E.2d, 12 Mass.L.Rptr. 154, 2000 WL 1473038 (Mass.Super.)

END OF DOCUMENT

© 2006 Thomson/West. No Claim to Orig. U.S. Govt. Works.

Page 1 of 2

EXHIBIT 7



COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS | PUBLIC EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT ADMINISTRATION COMMISSION

DOMENIC J. F. RUSSO, Chairman | A. JOSEPH DENUCCI, Vice Chairman
KENNETH J. DONNELLY | ERIC A. KRISS | JAMES M. MACHADO | DONALD R. MARQUIS

JOSEPH E. CONNARTON, Executive Director

August 11, 2004

Geeta McGrath, Senior Investigator State Ethics Commission Room 619 One Ashburton Place Boston, MA 02108

RE: Plymouth Retirement Board - Thomas Kelley

Dear Ms. McGrath:

Enclosed is the Plymouth Retirement Board's response to my letter of June 3, 2004 relating to alleged actions by the Board's Chairman, Thomas Kelley. Based on the response, it would appear that the Board arrived at its conclusion by meeting with Mr. Kelley. It is unclear to the Commission whether any other individuals, including Captain Botieri, had been interviewed or asked to attend the meeting at which the complaint was discussed.

Finally, I note that the Board has asked that the use of Plymouth Police Department stationary be investigated further. I have no information in this regard, but if I can be of assistance, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Joseph E. Connarton Executive Director

Easth E. Connerton

JEC/bjp
p:\legal\bphillips\plymouth re kelley4.doc
Enclosure

cc:

Captain Michael E. Botieri Attorney General Thomas Reilly Plymouth Town Manager, Pamela Nolan Town of Plymouth Board of Selectmen Plymouth Retirement Board



EXHIBIT 8

boston.com

THIS STORY HAS BEEN FORMATTED FOR EASY PRINTING

PLYMOUTH

Plymouth retirees group urges tighter reins on travel budget

The Boston Globe

Others defend pension board's spending record

By Matt Carroll, Globe Staff | November 17, 2005

Town of Plymouth retirees this week called on the Plymouth Retirement System's board members to curb their travel habits following word that they have, over the past three years, spent far more on travel than any other area retirement board.

Members of the Plymouth Retired Employees Association executive committee — while praising the board for investments that has led to multimillion-dollar growth in the \$94 million fund — said the board's travel spending was excessive.

It would make more financial sense if one board member attended a seminar and then reported back to the others, rather than having several members attend conferences, said Claire Soares, president of the association.

"There is no reason they have to spend so much money," said Soares.

The board has spent \$66,182 on trips to retirement seminars in places such Puerto Rico and Orlando, Fla., the Globe found following a review of its records. In 2004, the board spent \$26,861 on seven trips, \$20,000 more than was spent by the next-biggest spender, the Norfolk County system. There are 14 retirement systems in the area.

"I'd like to see them cut back," said Bud Krueger, a member of the association's executive committee, who is also a former selectman and Town Meeting moderator. "A little more frugality is called for."

Michael Sacco, a lawyer for the Plymouth Retirement System, declined to comment. The board previously has defended its travel practices as essential, saying board members need to attend professional seminars in order to oversee the town's pension funds effectively.

Although members of the Plymouth Retired Employees Association executive committee criticized the board, others either defended them or took a wait-and-see attitude.

Alba Thompson, a former president of the association, said "that board has done tremendous things for retirees. I don't want to see a rush to judgment." She said she wanted to learn more.

Bill Dykstra of Braintree , a 77-year-old retiree who is chairman of the investment committee for Arrow Mutual Insurance Co., defended the travel.

The board has more than \$94 million in assets, he said, and if what its members learn by attending professional conferences can help "by one-tenth of 1 percent, that's \$93,000" in investment profits, Dykstra said.

"They got a darn good return. What they spend on seminars and travel is a pittance."

Retirement boards oversee pension fund investments. The state has 106 public boards, which range from boards that cover a single town, such as in Plymouth, to statewide systems with billions in assets.

The Plymouth Retirement Board handles the investments for the town's retirees, and is not to be confused

Case 1:05-cv-10596-MBB Document 37-10 Filed 10/30/2006 Page 3 of 3

Tynicath retirees group urges tighter reins on travel budget - The Boston Globe

Page 2 of 2

with the larger Plymouth County Retirement Board, which oversees pension funds for retired school and municipal employees from across the county.

The state Public Employee Retirement Administration Commission has oversight of the boards, but no limits are set on travel, which is up to individual boards.

Other retirement boards roughly comparable to Plymouth in size have spent far less on travel. The Weymouth and Braintree boards spent \$25,949 and \$10,580, respectively, over the past three years.

On one occasion, seven Plymouth board and staff members attended a four-day conference in Hyannis, staying overnight in a hotel that is about a 40-minute drive from Plymouth.

The members of the board are chairman Thomas M. Kelley, Shawn Duhamel, Richard Manfredi, John Murphy Jr., and Bruce Miller.

Matt Carroll can be reached at mcarroll@globe.com. ■

© Copyright 2005 The New York Times Company

EXHIBIT 9

		1		
1	Page 1			Page 3
i:	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS	1	INDEX	
	CA No. 05 10596 NMG	2		
	THOMAS KELLEY,	3	WITNESS: Debra J. Sullivan	
	Plaintiff,	4		
Ī	vs.	5	EXAMINATION:	Page
	TOWN OF PLYMOUTH and ROBERT J. POMEROY, as Chief of the Plymouth Police Department	6	By Mr. Silverfine	4
. [and Individually, Defendants.	7	By Mr. Gallitano	56
	VOLUME I Pages 1 - 66	8	By Mr. Sacco	63
	DEPOSITION OF DEBRA J. SULLIVAN, a witness	9		
	called by counsel for the Defendants, taken before Suzanne M. Hebert, Professional Shorthand Reporter	10	EXHIBITS	
Ī	and Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of	11	No. Pa	age
1	Massachusetts, at Brody, Hardoon, Perkins & Kesten, LLP, One Exeter Plaza, Boston, MA, on Friday, June 9,	12	1 Letter to Plaintiff from	
	2006, commencing at 11:24 a.m.	13	Witness 1/29/04	29
1		14	2 Letter to Chief Pomeroy	
		15	from Witness 9/9/03	41
	•	16	3 Plymouth Retirement Boar	d
j		17	Findings of Fact	46
		18	•	
		19	(Exhibits retained by Jeremy I. S	Silverfine, Esq.)
		20		
		21		
		22		
		23		
ļ		24		
	Page 2			Page 4
1	APPEARANCES:	1	PROCEEDINGS	
2		2	DEBRA J. SULLIVAN,	
3	Joseph R. Gallitano, Esq.	3	having been first duly sworn by the	court
4	34 Main Street Ext., Suite 202	4	reporter, testified as follows:	
5	Plymouth, MA 02360	5	EXAMINATION	
6	for the Plaintiff;	6	BY MR. SILVERFINE:	
7		7	Q. Good morning, Ms. Sullivan. I'	m Jeremy
8	Brody, Hardoon, Perkins & Kesten, LLP	. 8	Silverfine. I introduced myself a few n	
9	By: Jeremy I. Silverfine, Esq.	9	We're here to take your deposition today	
10	One Exeter Plaza	10	of Thomas Kelley vs. the Town of Plyn	outh. Have you
11	Boston, MA 02116	11	ever had your deposition taken before?	
12	for the Defendants;	12	A. No.	
13	T 0.00	13	Q. Let me just run down, if I can, a	
14	Law Offices of Michael Sacco	14	items and explain what's going to happe	
15	By: Michael Sacco, Esq.	15	will be asking you a series of questions	
16	285 College Highway, P.O. Box 479	16	obligated to answer those questions. If	
16			understand a question, you have to let n	
17	Southampton, MA 01073		Voll need me to reneat comething you b	
17 18	for the Witness.		you need me to repeat something, you h	ave to let me
17 18 19	for the Witness.	19	know, and I'll be happy to do so.	
17 18 19 20		19 20	know, and I'll be happy to do so. You have to give an affirmati	ve
17 18 19 20 21	for the Witness.	19 20 21	know, and I'll be happy to do so. You have to give an affirmati response, "yes," "no," whatever answer.	ve You can't
17 18 19 20 21 22	for the Witness.	19 20 21 22	know, and I'll be happy to do so. You have to give an affirmati response, "yes," "no," whatever answer. shake your head, and that's because the	ve You can't stenographer
17 18 19 20 21	for the Witness.	19 20 21 22 23	know, and I'll be happy to do so. You have to give an affirmati response, "yes," "no," whatever answer.	ve You can't stenographer allow you

Page 7

₽	a	q	е	5

Document 37-11

1

2

5

6

9

14

4

- 1 finish my question before answering it, so, again,
- 2 the stenographer can take down the information.
- 3 If at any time you need a break, use
- the ladie's room, coffee, there is coffee in the
- 5 room, but if for any reason you need a break or to
- talk to Counsel, let me know, and we'll take a break. 6
- Hopefully we won't be that long, but those are 7
- essentially the ground rules; do you understand that? 8
- 9 A. I think so.
- 10 MR. SILVERFINE: And, Mr. Gallitano, usual
- 11 stipulations?
- 12 MR. SILVERFINE: That's fine.
- 13 Q. In terms of your participation, what will
- 14 happen, they'll be a transcript made. We'll send the
- transcript to you, and you'll have 30 days to read
- and sign. If there is any errors that the
- 17 stenographer, additions to make, you'll be given an
- 18 opportunity to do so. If you don't do so within 30
- 19 days of receipt, it will be deemed waived and the
- transcript deemed as is; do you understand that?
- 21 A. Okay.
- 22 Q. Could you just give us your full name.
- 23 A. Debra J. Sullivan.
- 24 Q. Ms. Sullivan, are you here today with

- Q. And what did you do for them?
- A. I was an administrative assistant.
- 3 Q. How long did you work there as an
- administrative assistant?
- A. Five years.
 - Q. Just in general, tell us what your duties
- 7 are as a director of the Retirement Board for the
- 8 Town of Plymouth.
 - A. Day-to-day activities, such as, dealing
- with membership, retirees, investment advisors, 10
- 11 retirement board, staff.
- 12 Q. Could you tell us previously what your
- 13 educational background is.
 - A. High school and Associate's.
- 15 Q. Where did you get your Associate's from?
- 16 A. I didn't finish that. That would be at
- 17 Massasoit.
- 18 Q. And could you just briefly describe your
- 19 work history after leaving high school and attending
- 20 Massasoit.
- 21 A. I worked at Massasoit Community College
- 22 first as an administrative assistant, then went to a
- 23 private entity, Tool and Dye Shop. I don't know what
- they call it today, a do everything job, but went

Page 6

- counsel?
- 2

1

- 3 Q. Who is your counsel, for the record?
- 4 A. Michael Sacco.
- 5 Q. You understand Mr. Sacco is also a witness
- 6 in this case?
- 7 A. I understand that.
- 8 Q. Okay. Could you give us your address home
- 9 address?
- 10 A. Do you want mailing or residence?
- 11 Q. Why don't you give us residential address.
- 12 A. 250 Meadow Street, Carver, Mass.
- 13 Q. What is your occupation?
- 14 A. I'm the director of the Plymouth Retirement
- 15 System.
- 16 Q. Is that a full-time job?
- 17 A. Yes, it is.
- 18 Q. And how long have you been director for the
- 19 retirement system?
- 20 A. Approximately 11 years.
- 21 Q. And prior to your work as the director for
- 22 the retirement system for Plymouth, where did you
- 23 work?
- 24 A. For the Plymouth County Retirement System.

- Page 8
- 1 back to Massasoit, and this is for continuing 2 education, and was the Dean's secretary.
- 3
- Q. And how long did you do that for?
 - A. 15 years.
- 5 Q. And then what year did you become the
- 6 administrative secretary, or assistant, I'm sorry, at
- 7 the Plymouth Retirement Board?
- 8 A. I want to say it was either '85 or '86.
- 9 Q. And you said you were an administrative
- assistant for 11 years, or do I have that wrong? You
- 11 have been a director for 11 years?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. How long were you in administrative for?
- 14 A. Approximately 15 years.
- Q. So 1990 did you become the director --15
- 16 A. It was '90, '91, in there.
- 17 Q. And was there another job in between the
- 18 director and the administrative assistant?
- 19 A. Well, not really. At the time, the office
- was myself and a part-time bookkeeper, and then as 20
- 21 the job grew, we added a full-time administrative
- 22 assistant. Not sure of the sequence of events here,
- 23 but she was the administrative assistant and then I
- 24 think I became the director and we added another

23

24

Q. And he's been your employer for how long?

A. Well, Chapter 697 came in, which was 1986,

				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
		Page 9	-	Page 1:
	1	individual as well.	1	I think, when the Board went from a three-member
	2	Q. Have you worked for the retirement board	2	board to a five-member board.
	3	continuous from 1985 to present?	3	Q. And you have known him since '86, is that
	4	A. For a retirement board; is that your	4	fair to say, or have you known him before 1986?
	5	question?	5	A. I have known him since he was on the Board.
	6	Q. Well, for the Plymouth Retirement Board.	6	Q. That was 1986?
	7	A. Plymouth Retirement Board was from '90,	7	A. Yes.
	8	'91, to the present.	8	Q. So it's someone you work with as well as
	9	Q. And then the last 11 years you have been	9	him being your employer, is that fair to say, in
	10		10	other words, he's your employer and you work with him
	11	White the first of the	11	as well on the Board?
	12		12	A. I work with all of the Board.
	13	c == == , == , == , == , == , == , == ,	13	Q. How many members of the Board did you say
	14	II y	14	there were?
	15		15	A. Five.
	16	C appoint	16	Q. And that includes Mr. Kelley?
	17		1.7	A. That's correct.
	18	C	18	Q. Is that presently is he your employer?
	19		19	A. All five are my employers, yes.
	20	A. I'm trying to think who was there. I	20	Q. But including Mr. Kelley as of today?
	21	believe it was Shawn Duhamel Mr. Manfredi.	21	A. Yes.
	22	Q. Mr. Murphy	22	Q. And he has been your employer since 1986,
	23	A. John Murphy. There is five guys. Who did	23	you said?
	24	I miss? At the time, it was Patrick Dello Russo.	24	A. Yes.
		Page 10		Page 12
i	1	Q. Is there a term of appointment?	1	Q. And what type of personal relationship do
	2	A. No.	2	you have with him?
1	3	Q. So once you're appointed, you're on for	3	A. I wouldn't say that there is a personal
	4	life?	4	relationship. He's my boss.
ı	5	A. Well, I'm at the will of the Board.	5	Q. Have you been to his home?
ı	6	Q. And so you're an employee at will?	6	A. Have I been to his home, yes.
	7	A. Right.	7	Q. Has he been to your home?
	8	Q. There is no reappointment process, you	8	A. Yes.
ı	9	service until whenever basically?	9	Q. Socialize with him?
	10	A. Exactly.	10	A. No.
ı	11	Q. And this position is a full-time, paid	11	Q. Have you ever been on his boat?
ļ	12	position?	12	A. Once.
١	13	A. That's correct.	13	Q. Do you have regular telephone contact with
ĺ	14	Q. What is your current salary?	14	him?
ı	15	A. I'm not sure. I think it's \$75,000.	15	A. Yes. Do I get to elaborate on any of that?
	16	Q. Besides your work for the Retirement Board,	16	Q. Actually, the way the process works, I get
	17		17	to ask questions
	18 19	l l	18	A. And I get to answer them.
l	20		19	Q. If there is a question, for instance –
I			20	Mr. Gallitano will have an opportunity to ask you
	21		21	questions. If Mr. Sacco decides he wants to ask you
	22	A. He's my employer.	22	questions, he has an opportunity to ask you

23 questions, but otherwise, you're obligated to answer

24 the questions. If you don't understand a question,

Page 16

Pag	- Δ	7	ત્ર
Pag	e	J.	J

- 1 of course, please let me know; otherwise, that's how
- 2 it works, and the question and answers limited in --
- 3 if I don't ask a good question --
- 4 A. Okay.
- 5 Q. Answer as best you can. In terms of the
- 6 deposition, did you do anything to prepare yourself
- 7 for the deposition today?
- 8 A. I spoke with Board counsel.
- 9 Q. When you say "Board counsel," is that
- 10 Mr. Sacco?
- 11 A. That's correct.
- 12 Q. Without telling me conversations with
- 13 Mr. Sacco, is there any documents you reviewed for
- 14 today?
- 15 A. No.
- 16 Q. Is there anyone else you spoke to besides
- 17 Mr. Sacco in preparation for today relative to the
- 18 deposition?
- 19 A. No.
- 20 Q. For instance, did you speak to Mr. Kelley?
- 21 A. No.
- 22 Q. Or Mr. Kelley's attorney?
- 23 A. No.
- Q. During the time period that you worked with

- A. We met normally once a month.
- Q. Okay. And during the time period you have
- 3 served on the Retirement Board, has there been any
- 4 other police officer who has served on the Retirement
- 5 Board?

1

2

- 6 A. Police officer, no.
- 7 Q. In particular, do you recall the complaints
- 8 that Mr. Kelley made, vis-a-vis, this annoyance that
- 9 you have told us about, what exactly did he say?
- 10 A. I don't remember exactly what he would say.
- Q. All right, as best you can remember?
- 12 A. Just, you know, like, for instance, you
- 13 know, they don't charge back anyone else with the
- 14 retirement system, would be charged for the time that
- he was with us, so it was more of an annoyance that
 no one else who worked for the Town had to go through
- 17 that or the system versus he had to go through that.
- 18 Q. When you say they would call, they call you
- 19 directly --
- 20 A. They would call the office, yeah.
- 21 Q. Who would call you?
- 22 A. Lynn Fortini,
- 23 Q. Who's that?
- 24 A. Chief's secretary or administrative

Page 14

- 1 Mr. Kelley and have worked with Mr. Kelley, has he
- 2 discussed with you the issues he's had with the
- 3 police department?
- 4 A. He has come into the office and, you know,
- 5 spoken about his problem with the Chief.
- Q. When did this begin?
 - A. I would say after he had -- I'm not sure
- 8 whether it was during his retirement process or after
- 9 his retirement -- after he was retired.
- 10 Q. Is that the first time you recall him
- 11 complaining about the Chief or the police department,
- 12 at least with you?
- 13 A. No.
- 14 Q. When was the first time you heard him
- 15 complain of the Chief or the police department?
- 16 A. As a board member, he was -- well, the
- 17 police department would call the office to find out
- 18 when the meetings were held, the time when Mr. Kellev
- 19 left and he came, and that was an annoyance to
- 20 Mr. Kelley.
- 21 Q. That's something he expressed to you, that
- 22 it was an annoyance to him?
- 23 A. Certainly.
- 24 Q. How much did he express that?

assistant.

- 2 Q. What would the conversations with Lynn
- 3 Fortini be?

1

9

- 4 A. She would just ask what time he left or
- 5 what time the Retirement Board ended.
- 6 Q. Relative to meetings that you had,
- 7 Ms. Fortini would call and find out what time it
- 8 began and ended?
 - A. Yes.
- 10 Q. Anything else that you recall Ms. Fortini
- 11 inquiring about?
- 12 A. No.
- 13 Q. Any other complaints that Mr. Kelley had
- 14 that you recall, vis-a-vis, his work at the police
- 15 department?
- 16 A. Not specifically, no.
- Q. Did he make complaints to you -- were you
- 18 aware of complaints he made about Chief Pomeroy?
- 19 A. Specifically, no.
 - Q. How about Captain Botieri?
- 21 A. When I say "specifically," I don't remember
- 22 any particular instance. There was a social
- 23 engagement that, I guess, Mr. Kelley had been to and
- 24 there was words between -- I'm not sure if it was

Page	1	7

- Botieri or who exactly it was.
- 2 Q. Were you present at that function?
- 3 A. No.
- Q. How did you hear about this interaction
- between Mr. Botieri and Mr. Kelley, what did
- Mr. Kelley tell you?
- 7 A. Again, I'm trying to remember here. I
- 8 don't remember specifically, but from what I
- 9 understand, it was a situation that, whoever this
- police officer was, it was a social engagement, their 10
- wives were also there, and something was said to
- 12 Mr. Kelley to make Mr. Kelley angry and, you know, it
- 13 was that kind of a situation.
- 14 O. Do you remember what Mr. Kelley told you
- 15 got him angry?
- 16 A. I don't remember.
- 17 Q. Are you aware Mr. Kelley has a temper?
- 18 MR. GALLITANO: Objection.
- 19 Q. You can answer. That's an objection as to
- 20 form. You can answer the question.
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. And had you seen examples of Mr. Kelley's
- 23 temper during the time period you have worked with
- 24 him?

Page 20

- 1 Q. Do you recall at some point during the time
 - period you worked with Mr. Kelley some issues
- relating to Quinn Bill benefits that were being paid
- out to the Chief and other higher-ranking members of
- the police department?
 - A. Paid out to them?
- 7 O. Yes.

6

- A. No.
- Q. Do you recall any issue in the Town of
- Plymouth relating to a question of whether or not
- certain Quinn Bill benefits should be paid to certain
- 12 members of the police department?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. What is your recollection of the issue that
- 15 was at hand relative to the Quinn Bill benefits?
- 16 A. That the Chief, when someone goes out under
- 17 a retirement benefit, pension benefit, accidental
- benefit, if it was under the presumption -- the Chief 18
- 19 would not pay for 111F benefits, okay, until and
- 20 after the person had been retired and been proven
- 21 that there was a disability.
- 22 Q. I don't want to confuse you at all, so I
- 23 want to make sure you're answering my question, and I
- 24 should start off: Do you know what the Quinn Bill

Page 18

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. And could you tell us what you have seen in 3 the past relative to his temper?
- A. Only that he will get short. He never gets
- 5 physical or anything like that. He might get short 6 in his language.
- 7 Q. When you say "his language," is it abusive 8 language?
- 9 A. No.
- 10 Q. Is it language that has profanity?
- 11
- 12 Q. Just a quickened type of pace in terms of
- 13 the response?
- 14 A. Right.
- 15 Q. Again, I don't want to put words in your
- 16 mouth. I'm asking you to explain what you have seen. 17
 - A. Normally, the relationship is such that we
- 18 can talk business on a director to board member, but
- 19 there are times he might get short with me, in that I
- am not giving him, maybe, the answer that he would 20
- 21 like to hear.
- 22 Q. So he gets agitated if he's not getting the
- 23 response he thinks he wants to get, fair to say?
- 24 A. Yes.

- benefits are, before I even go there?
- 2 A. I'm thinking that it's to do with 111F 3 payments,
 - Q. If I said to you the Quinn Bill benefits
- 4 are different than 111F benefits, would that help you 5
- at all, and, again, it's your memory?
- 7 A. Again, the Quinn Bill is not something that
- 8 I'm versed in, so it may be something that I knew
- 9 when it comes up or that I look up this kind of
- 10 thing, but I guess at this point in time, I'm not --
- 11 of what the Quinn Bill, is guess.
- 12 Q. If I suggested the Quinn Bill benefits has
- 13 to do with added remuneration to police officers for
- 14 having taken advance courses and gotten degrees,
- 15 would that help you at all?
- 16 A. There is educational allowance.
- 17 Q. Do you remember an issue being raised in
- 18 the Town of Plymouth as to Quinn Bill benefits being
- 19 paid to certain high-ranking officers in the Town of
- 20 Plymouth Police Department?
- 21 A. There are people who receive extra monies
- 22 because of education, yes.
 - Q. Do you remember an issue being raised in
- 24 the Town as to this payment of Quinn Bill benefits?

ъ	_	~	_	-	1
r	а	u	e		. 1

Document 37-11

1

4

8

11

20

1

- A. I don't recall. 1
- 2 Q. Do you recall whether or not Mr. Kelley
- complained about certain officers receiving extra pay
- under the Quinn Bill as it related to Plymouth Police
- Officers?
- 6 A. I don't recall.
- 7 Q. Do you recall any conversations you had or
- overhearing Mr. Kelley complaining or questioning the
- issuance or payment of Quinn Bill benefits to certain
- 10 officers in the Town of Plymouth?
- A. I don't recall. 11
- 12 Q. Let me take a step back. Before I went to
- 13 the Quinn Bill, I started talking about 111F
- benefits. What is your recollection about what
- 15 complaints you heard from Mr. Kelley relative to
- 16 receipt of 111F benefits?
- 17 A. Mr. Kelley making?
- 18 Q. Mr. Kelley, right.
- 19 A. Making complaints?
- 20 O. Right.
- 21 A. All right, say that again, please.
- 22 Q. Again, I'm assuming, and I'll get to it in
- a moment, but you understand what 111F benefits are? 23
- 24 A. Yes.

- A. Personally, no.
- 2 Q. Did you ever hear Mr. Kelley describe what
- 3 the relationship was?
 - A. He didn't care for him.
- 5 Q. How about the relationship between Captain
- 6 Botieri and Mr. Kelley?
- 7 A. I don't think he cared for him either.
 - Q. Did Mr. Kelley express why he didn't care
- 9 for Chief Pomeroy?
- 10 A. Probably did.
 - Q. What's your memory of that?
- 12 A. I would be speculating.
- 13 Q. I'm just asking for your memory, not asking
- 14 to speculate.
- MR. GALLITANO: She doesn't remember, she 15
- 16 doesn't remember.
- 17 MR. SILVERFINE: I think Mr. Sacco is
- 18 representing her, if I'm not mistaken, and she's
- certainly doing a fine job answering the questions.
 - MR. GALLITANO: She certainly is.
- 21 MR. SILVERFINE: I certainly can ask her,
- 22 and haven't asked her anything improper, can
- 23 certainly ask her questions about her memory.
- 24 MR. GALLITANO: Go right ahead.

- Q. What's your understanding of them? 1
- 2 A. When someone has gone out for injury on
- duty. As far as my business is concerned, 111F is
- treated like workman's comp., in that it's not
- taxable income, and, therefore, we treat it
- differently in the retirement system than we do
- 7 normal contributions.
- Q. Do you recall having conversations with
- Mr. Kelley about his receipt of any or lack thereof
- 10 of any 111F benefits?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Tell us what you recall about your
- 13 conversations with Mr. Kelley on 111F benefits.
- 14 A. Again, when he retired -- again, I don't
- 15 remember specific conversations, but it was after he
- 16 had been approved and retired, he had, you know,
- 17 about Chief Pomeroy not paying him his 111F, not
- 18 converting that sick time back to his 111F, which was
- 19 a usual thing to do.
- 20 Q. All right. You're familiar with Chief
- 21 Pomeroy?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 O. Do you know what the relationship between
- 24 Mr. Kelley and Chief Pomeroy was?

- Page 24
- Q. Before I was interrupted, just tell me what you remember about Mr. Kelley expressing to you about
- 3 his relationship or his lack thereof with Chief
- 4 Pomeroy.
- 5 A. He didn't care for Mr. Pomeroy, or Chief
- 6 Pomeroy, because of the way that he managed -- okay.
- It would be based upon his decisions, his decisions.
- 8 Q. So you're saying Mr. Kelley expressed that
- he didn't care for the way Chief Pomeroy made his 9
- 10 decisions as related to Mr. Kelley?
- 11 A. Correct.
- 12 Q. Did he express anything in particular, that
- 13 you recall?
- 14 A. Just the 111F issue and, again, it had to
- do with his not being, you know, being watched when 15
- 16 he was at a board meeting.
- 17 Q. Anything else that you can recall, anything
- 18 else other than those two items that you recall
- 19 him --
- 20 A. I don't recall other than those two.
- 21 Q. How about, what did he say about his
- 22 relationship with Captain Botieri?
- 23 A. Other than he worked for Pomeroy and as
- 24 such held the same, you know, relationship with

1

2

4

Page 25

- 1 Pomeroy.
- 2 Q. Okay. Did he have the same issues in terms
- 3 of the 111F benefits and the, as you called it, the
- 4 watching, coming and going from the meetings, any
- 5 other issue that you recall as it related to Captain
- 6 Botieri?
- 7 A. No.
- 8 Q. Did he express any other animosity toward
- 9 any other officers besides Chief Pomeroy and Captain
- 10 Botieri, that you recall?
 - A. There was Mr. Flynn.
- 12 Q. Who's Mr. Flynn?
- 13 A. Peter Flynn. He's a police officer.
- 14 Q. Do you know his rank?
- 15 A. No.
- 16 Q. What was Mr. Kelley's issue with Peter
- 17 Flynn?

11

- 18 A. His issue with Mr. Flynn was because
- 19 Mr. Flynn was -- what's the word? I can't think of
- 20 the word. He had dealings with the retirement office
- 21 and Mr. Peter Flynn was very -- what's the word,
- 22 awful to us on the phone, you know, on e-mails. He
- 23 had come to the Board for some kind of specific
- 24 benefit that he thought he was entitled to and the
 - Page

- Page 27

 Q. Did Mr. Kelley ever describe to you his
- other grievances he had with the police department
- besides the ones that you have described?
 - A. Not that I can recall.
- 5 Q. Did he ever talk to you about his issues he
- 6 had a few years ago where he brought a matter to the
- 7 Inspector General's office?
- 8 A. There was something, but I don't remember
- 9 what it was.
- 10 Q. Did he ever talk to you or did you ever
- 11 hear him talk about his complaints about ranking
- 12 officers and the receipt of Ouinn Bill benefits?
- 13 Again, I'm just trying to refresh your memory and see
- 14 if you have any memory. If you don't, that's fine.
- 15 A. I don't, sorry.
- 16 Q. Besides what you have told us as it relates
- 17 to Mr. Kelley's 111F benefits, was there any other
- 18 further discussions relating to the Heart Law issue
- 19 that he was trying -- let me leave it at that, the
- 20 Heart Law issue, retirement issue, with him?
- 21 A. Restate that.

22

- Q. Poorly-phrased question. Did you ever hear
- 23 Mr. Kelley complain or did he make any statements as
- 24 it related to his claim that he was entitled to a

Page 26

- Board had voted not to give it to him, so -- I can't
- 2 even think of it. Isn't this awful? I'm going brain
- 3 dead. Oh, God,
- When somebody is doesn't speak
- well to you, and, you know, this kind of thing, and
- 6 so Mr. Kelley was upset with Mr. Flynn for being
- 7 impolite, this kind of thing, to the Board, to the
- 8 staff of the Board, basically.
- 9 Q. Going back this second, if I can, to the
- 10 incident, which I think you described a few minutes
- 11 ago, about the social function, which I think you
- 12 said Mr. Kelley and Mr. Botieri had some kind of
- 13 words -
- 14 A. I don't know if it was Mr. Botieri. I
- 15 don't know specifically if it was Mr. Botieri, but I
- 16 know -- no, I don't know who it was.
- Q. Did you ever hear Mr. Kelley say to anyone,
- 18 including Mr. Botieri, "Don't ever appear in front of
- 19 us," meaning, the Retirement Board?
- 20 MR. GALLITANO: Objection.
- A. No, I didn't hear any such thing.
- Q. Have you ever heard Mr. Kelley say that to
- 23 anyone?
- 24 A. No.

- Page 28 Heart Law benefit as a police officer?
- A. Yes.
- 3 Q. Tell us what you recall about that,
 - A. That he had gone out -- it had been decided
- 5 and voted and approved by the medical doctors that he
- 6 had a heart attack and had it on the job and wasn't
- 7 to be given his benefits.
- 8 Q. Are you aware of this drill that Mr. Kelley
- 9 participated in where he got injured?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Prior to that, I believe the date, if I'm
- 12 not mistaken, was May 25, 2003, I'll represent that
- 13 to you for the moment, if you'll take that as the
- 14 date, and do you recall whether or not Mr. Kelley
- 15 ever expressed to you that he had any medical issues
- 16 prior to that date?

- A. I don't know. I don't know.
- 18 Q. Were you aware in any way, besides what
- 19 Mr. Kelley may have said or not said to you, were you
 - 0 aware in any way of any medical issues Mr. Kelley had
- 21 prior to May 25, 2003?
- 22 A. Again, I don't know when sequentially.
- 23 Things happen. I remember he had a hernia and he was
- 24 in the hospital for that, but I don't know whether it

1

4

6

11

19

22

1

7

Page 31

Page 32

_	~ ~
Page	29

- was before or after.
- 2 Q. How did you become aware of his injury on
- 3 May 25, 2003; do you remember?
- 4 A. I don't. I was trying to think of that,
- 5 when or how I was told. Town Hall, everybody knows
- 6 everyone, and obviously I received a phone call from
- 7 someone saying that Tom was in the hospital.
 - Q. It was someone other than Tom, as far as
- 9 you can remember?
- 10 A. Oh, yeah. No, it wasn't Tom.
- 11 Q. Then you, yourself, called other members of
- 12 the Board?

8

- 13 A. That's correct, as well as Town Counsel --
- 14 not Town Counsel, Michael.
- 15 Q. I'm going to show you some documents and
- 16 we're going to mark them and I'll ask you some
- 17 questions.
- 18 (Exhibit 1 marked for identification)
- 19 Q. I'll show you a document marked -- look at
- 20 the original and that way it's clear, Exhibit 1, and
- 21 ask you, first of all, if you recognize that document
- 22 which has been marked as Deposition Exhibit No. 1.
- 23 A. What is it you want me to do?
- 24 Q. Very first thing, do you recognize it?

- 2 Q. Was there any discussion of a lawsuit, for
- instance, that you recall?

A. No. I do not.

- A. No.
- 5 Q. Against the Town?
 - A. No.
- 7 Q. And you wrote that same first paragraph,
- 8 "Verification of your service as its elected member
- 9 began December 18, 1996;" do you see that?
- 10 A. Yes.
 - Q. And how did you determine December 18,
- 12 1996, as the date of service as an elected member for
- 13 Mr. Kelley, if you recall?
- 14 A. That would have been when Chapter 697 came
- 15 into being. I believe.
- 16 Q. All right. And just help me on this. It
- 17 says, "Elected member." Is that when Mr. Kelley
- 18 first became an elected member to the Board?
 - A. Yes.
- 20 Q. You have to actually run for the position?
- 21
 - Q. Prior to that, what was the procedure?
- 23 A. Prior to?
- 24 Q. December 18, 1996.

- A. Yes. 1
- 2 Q. In fact, does your signature appear at the
- 3 bottom?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. This letter is written to Thomas Kelley; is
- 6 that correct?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. And the first paragraph, the first line
- 9 says, "At your request;" do you see that?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. When did Mr. Kelley ask you to write this
- 12 letter?
- 13 A. Probably right before it. I don't recall
- 14 exactly when.
- Q. Do you recall for what purpose you 15
- 16 understood this letter was being written for?
- 17 A. Documentation that the Board was being
- 18 charged back for his time.
- 19 Q. And do you recall, was there any discussion
- 20 with Mr. Kelley relative to you writing this letter?
- 21 A. There must have been, otherwise, why would
- 22 I have written it?
- 23 Q. Do you remember what the conversation was
- 24 that caused you to write this letter?

- A. Prior to that, there were only three
- 2 members to the Board, and then the law changed, and
- 3 as part of the law changing, they added with it more
- 4 positions to the Retirement Board.
- 5 Q. Prior to December 18, 1996, did Mr. Kelley
- 6 serve on the Board in any capacity?
 - A. I don't believe so.
- 8 Q. So as far as you understood, his service on
- 9 the Retirement Board began December 18, 1996?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Do you know when the election took place,
- 12 by any chance?
- 13 A. It would have had to have been before that.
- 14 I'm not sure exactly when. I guess Chapter 697 went
- into being, off the top of my head, so there would
- 16 have had to have been an election and then his term
- 17 beginning.
- 18 Q. In the second paragraph of Exhibit 1 you
- 19 wrote, "During this time period, if you were
- 20 scheduled to work your position as a full-time police
- 21 officer and those hours conflicted with your service
- 22 on the Retirement Board, the retirement system was
- 23 required to reimburse the Town."
- 24 A. That's right.

Page 36

Page 3	3	

3

- 1 Q. Did Mr. Kelley specifically ask you to
- 2 describe that in this letter that you drafted?
- A. No.
- 4 Q. Why did you put that in there?
- A. Again, it was documentation as to why there
- 6 was a charge back on our payroll as to Mr. Kelley's 7 time.
- 8 Q. Do you recall from the period of December
- 9 18, 1996, to present how much the Town has been
- 10 charged back for his work?
- 11 A. I don't know total.
- 12 Q. Is there a record somewhere of that?
- 13 A. Oh, yes.
- 14 Q. Where is that kept?
- 15 A. In the office, in the general ledger it
- 16 would be.
- Q. Is that held in the Retirement Board?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. And is that something that is public
- 20 information?
- 21 A. Certainly.
- Q. And do you have an idea of how much time
- 23 per month that would have been?
- A. It would have been different depending upon

- 1 A. I wouldn't know that.
- 2 Q. You don't come across budgetary issues?
 - A. No, not for the Town.
- 4 Q. In particular, as it relates to this issue
- 5 of payback, did that come up before you as to why
- 6 that was being implemented?
- 7 A. I probably asked the chairman why as we
 - have our own budget and that monies wouldn't have
- 9 been budgeted for in the beginning as to why and how
- 10 that was going to take place.
- 11 Q. Do you recall what response you got back
- 12 from the chairman?
- 13 A. Just that we would be compensated -- not
- 14 compensated, but paying for the time that and it
- 15 would be done through the payroll.
- Q. Did that remain in effect up until the time
- 17 that Mr. Kelley retired?
- 18 A. That's right.

19

24

1

7

17

- Q. Now, you also wrote in Exhibit 1, the last
- 20 paragraph, you wrote, "It's my experience since 1991
- 21 as Board Director" -- is that because you were Board
- 22 Director as of 1991?
- 23 A. No. I wasn't Board Director in 1991.
 - Q. So when you wrote that --

- how long the board meeting went.
- 2 Q. Okay. Under what provision was the
- 3 retirement system required to reimburse the Town; do
- 4 you know how that worked? In other words, was there
- 5 a special addendum to something, an agreement; do you
- 6 remember?
- 7 A. I don't. I know that at the time the
- 8 chairman, Mr. Dello Russo, basically said that the
- 9 Retirement Board should pay for the time that he was
- 10 away. I'm sure that he had spoken, the chairman, at
- 11 the time had spoken to the Chief and worked this out.
- 12 Q. Are each of the separate departments, do
- 13 they have their own budgets?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. So the police department had their own
- 16 budget?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. So any time Mr. Kelley would have served on
- 19 the Board which they paid him for would have come out
- 20 of their budget?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. Is it fair to say that like many towns
- 23 Plymouth had certain budgetary constraints during the
- 24 past ten years?

- A. Well, that probably was not entirely
- correct, "as the Board Director," as the
- 3 administrative assistant/Board Director is probably
- 4 what it should have said.
- 5 Q. Because you were only Board Director
- 6 approximately the last 11 years, right?
 - A. That's right,
- 8 Q. So it's your experience since 1991 having
- 9 been on the Board?
- 10 A. That's correct.
- 11 Q. Not as Board Director?
- 12 A. That's correct.
- Q. You further wrote in Exhibit 1, "to have
- 14 this practice in your position," and is that your
- 15 position as a Retirement Board member you're
- 16 referring to or a position as a police officer?
 - A. Say that again.
- 18 Q. I'm trying to understand what you wrote in
- 19 Exhibit 1. You wrote, "It's been my experience since
- 20 1991 as Board Director to have this being the
- 21 practice in only your position."
- A. To be the practice of charging, being
- 23 charged back, the retirement system being charged
- 24 back for his time served as a board member.

1

6

14

1

4

9

Page 39

Page 37

- 1 Q. And is there any remuneration as a board
- 2 member?3 A. The only people that get remuneration would
- 4 be the exofficio. Everyone else is not paid.
- 5 O. Who's the exofficio?
 - A. At that time it would have been Patrick
- 7 Dello Russo.

6

- O. What's an exofficio?
- 9 A. By legislature that's either the town
- 10 accountant or in the Town of Plymouth's case are.
- 11 because of special legislation, it is the finance
- 12 director.
- 13 Q. Are board members entitled to certain
- 14 benefits, whether it be reimbursement for expenses or
- 15 travel expenses, anything like that, for attending
- 16 conferences?
- 17 A. Certainly.
- 18 Q. Who approves that, if you know?
- 19 A. The Retirement Board in total approves
- 20 that.
- Q. So the members approve their own expenses
- 22 and travel?
- 23 A. That's correct.
- Q. Is there any oversight to that, that you're

- A. That's correct.
- 2 Q. Are you aware, just asking if you're aware
- 3 of, any public safety officer who served on the
- 4 Retirement Board prior to your work in 1991?
- 5 A. I'm not aware of one,
 - Q. In the last sentence of Exhibit 1 you
- 7 wrote, "There are other board members who serve the
- 8 Town as well." What positions do other board members
- 9 hold and what are their names?
- 10 A. Patrick Dello Russo, which would have at
- 11 this time been the finance director, as well as the
- 12 other elected member, Mr. Manfredi, who is the
- 13 head -- what is he --
 - MR. GALLITANO: Building commissioner.
- 15 Q. Just to note, and I appreciate moving this
- 16 along, but it's really your memory that rules, that
- 17 governs. I need your memory, not Mr. Gallitano's
- 18 memory.
- 19 A. I know, but that is what it is.
- 20 Q. I understand. I'm just trying to explain,
- 21 your memory, as best you can.
- 22 A. Well, good luck.
- 23 Q. Fair enough. I actually didn't catch it,
- 24 Mr. Manfredi, head of --

Page 38

- 1 aware of?
- 2 A. There is audits, certainly, and we have a
- regulatory authority that oversees -- we have to have
- 4 regulations that set the parameter to what travel
- 5 requirements are and so forth.
- Q. Are those records kept by the Retirement
- 7 Board as well?
- 8 A. Certainly.
- 9 Q. So any travel records or conferences
- 10 attended or any expenses paid out are, also, kept by
- 11 the Retirement Board?
- 12 A. That's correct.
- 13 Q. For each and every member?
- 14 A. Correct.
- 15 Q. Getting back to Exhibit 1, and I know I
- 16 asked you this earlier but I'll ask it in a different
- 17 way: Since 1991, are you aware of any other police
- 18 officer or public safety officer that has served on
- 19 the Retirement Board?
- 20 A. There has not been one.
- Q. Is it fair to say Thomas Kelley was the
- 22 only public safety officer serving on the Board since
- 23 the very time you have been associated with the
- 24 Board?

- A. See. I couldn't hear you. I'm sorry.
- 2 He's the Commissioner of Public...
- 3 Q. Works?
 - A. No. Public buildings, that kind of thing.
- 5 Q. Anyone else during the time period that you
- 6 served on the Board served in other Town positions,
- 7 that you recall?
- 8 A. Say again, please.
 - Q. In other words, during the time period,
- 10 let's call it from December 18, 1996, until today,
- 11 any other board members serve the Town, as you wrote
- 12 in Exhibit 1?
- 13 A. There was also John Madden who served on
- 14 the Board for a short bit.
- 15 Q. What was John Madden's position?
- 16 A. He was the Town accountant.
- 17 Q. Prior to that, Michael Daley, who was the
- 18 finance director?
- 19 A. That's correct.
- 20 Q. Anyone else?
- 21 A. He's dead now, but Mr. Collary, I think was
- 22 his name. He was the treasurer and he served on the
- 23 Retirement Board. These are all before my time.
- 24 There was somebody else, a lady, but I don't know her

- name, and Drew, Mr. Drew, I don't remember his first
- 2 name. I think he served on the Retirement Board.
- Q. I don't know if you know the answer, any of 3
- the people you mentioned, Dello Russo, Manfredi,
- Madden, Daley, you, were any of them paid on an
- hourly basis by the Town, if you know?
- 7 A. I think everyone is paid on an hourly
- basis.
- 9 Q. It's not a yearly stipend salary that other
- 10 people get?
- A. My understanding is everybody is paid 11
- hourly. They have an annual figure or they may be
- salary but they get paid an hourly -- I think. 13
- 14 MR. SILVERFINE: We'll mark the second
- 15 document.
- 16 (Exhibit 2 marked for identification)
- Q. I'm going to show you what's been marked as 17
- 18 Exhibit 2 and ask you, first of all, if you recognize
- 19 this?

21

- 20 A. Yes.
 - O. What is it?
- 22 A. A letter that's sent out to the department
- 23 head. This particular letter would only go out to
- police or fire, because they're the only ones who get

Page 43

- Q. Was Mr. Kelley treated any differently than
- 2 any other Town employee?
 - A. No.

3

6

- 4 Q. Did he get special treatment because he was
- 5 on the Board?
 - A. No.
 - Q. You sent a copy to Mr. Kelley and to
- Mr. Sacco, I see, are at the bottom, along with human
- resources. For what purpose did you send it to
- 10 Mr. Sacco?
- 11 A. As the Board's attorney, to let him know
- 12 the application was complete.
- Q. Likewise, what purposes did you send it to 13
- 14 the human resource department?
- 15 A. To let them know the person is retiring.
- 16 Q. Once you sent this letter out, does the
- 17 clock stop ticking on whatever benefits Mr. Kelley
- 18 was getting as of September 8 and he then transfers
- 19 to a different system; is that how it works?
- 20 A. At this point here, it let's payroll,
- 21 number one, know to take him off the payroll, to stop
- 22 his earnings, sick time, whatever it is that the
- 23 person is using, to stop that so that the
- 24 contributions then stop. Human resources then are

- 111F, when someone has, in fact, been approved for
- 2 accident disability under Section 7.
- 3 Q. You recognize your signature on this,
- Exhibit 2?
- 5
- 6 Q. You sent it on September 9, 2003, to Robert
- Pomeroy, the Chief of Police?
- A. Yes. 8
- 9 Q. And were you mandated to send this letter
- 10 out by some provision?
- 11 A. I believe it's under the regulations, the
- 12 Perac regulation.
- 13 Q. You wrote in the first paragraph, "Please
- 14 be advised September 8, 2003, the Commission approved
- 15 the decision to grant disability."
- 16 A. That's correct.
- 17 Q. Was this a quick turnaround you issued this
- 18 letter?
- 19 A. No.
- 20 Q. Would this be the normal course of business
- 21 you would issue this kind of letter?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. Did you do this for other retirees as well?
- 24 A. Yes,

- Page 44
- made aware so that they can contact the retiree to
- counsel them as far as health insurance, and then
- they let me know what kind of contributions I should
- 4 be holding for deductions.
- Q. Did you have any conversations with
- 6 Mr. Kelley prior to the issuance of this letter,
- 7 Exhibit 2, prior to its issuance on September 9,
- 8 2003?
- 9 A. I don't recall.
- 10 Q. Did you call him up and say, "September 8,
- 11 Perac approved your accident disability"?
- 12 A. I may have.
- 13 Q. Was that something you would do with all
- 14 retirees?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. So you would call anyone, any employee, who
- 17 had applied?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. When you wrote the second paragraph, "No
- 20 further retirement deductions should be withheld for
- 21 any amounts payable," whose attention were you
- 22 drawing that to?
- 23 A. Payroll.
- 24 Q. For Town of Plymouth?

- A. Yes.
- 2 Q. So they can draw up and take care of
- Mr. Kelley's ---
- 4 A. Because of that date he then becomes
- retired. That becomes his termination date.
- Benefits or payroll should stop, contributions should
- 7 stop.
- 8 Q. Did you have any complaints from Mr. Kelley
- 9 as to the way this was being handled back in
- 10 September 2003?
- 11 A. Complaints with this?
- 12 Q. Yes.
- 13 A. No.
- 14 Q. Talking about Exhibit 2.
- 15 A. No.
- 16 Q. Any complaints about deductions or anything
- that was happening, vis-a-vis, his payroll at that
- 18 point in time, that you recall?
- 19 A. No.
- 20 Q. Do you recall any discussions that you had,
- 21 vis-a-vis, whatever monies he may or may not have
- 22 been due back on September 9, 2003, when you issued
- 23 this letter?

1

24 A. I don't recall. Page 47

Page 48

- 1 Q. Is this something you recognize as being
- 2 the Plymouth Retirement Board's findings of fact as
- 3 related to Thomas Kelley? Again, take your time
- 4 looking over Exhibit 3.
 - A. This is correct.
- 6 Q. In terms of Exhibit 3 on Paragraph 4, it
- 7 says, "By my letter dated September 3, 2003, legal
- 8 counsel informed the Board that the panel applied the
- 9 appropriate standards in addressing the issues of
- incapacity, permanency, and causation." First of 10
- all, talking about legal counsel, talking about
- 12 Mr. Sacco?

5

13

14

19

- A. Right.
- Q. And he was then legal counsel to the
- 15 Retirement Board?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. You would look to him for legal advice as
- 18 it related to different applications for retirement?
 - A. One of the things.
- 20 O. And then in this case included Mr. Kellev's
- 21 applications; is that fair to say?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. And according to Paragraph 4, Mr. Sacco
- 24 opined that the Board had the authority to grant

- Mr. Kelley's application; is that accurate?
 - 2 A. That's correct.
 - 3 Q. And that's part of the reason why you
 - issued the letter on September 9, which is Exhibit 2,
 - 5 correct?
 - 6 A. Yes.
 - 7 Q. At the bottom of the first page of Exhibit
 - 8 3 under 5a it says, "Kelley passed pre-employment
 - 9 physical prior to his appointment to the Plymouth
 - 10 Police Department which did not reveal any evidence
 - 11 of hypertension or heart disease." What information
 - 12 did you have or the Board have as to that fact?
 - 13 A. The Retirement Board has the physicals on
 - 14 any individual that comes into the Town of Plymouth.
 - They all have to pass a pre-employment physical exam. 15
 - 16 Q. Do you know whether or not there is a
 - 17 review of all medical files of an applicant, even
 - 18 information after the pre-employment physical, as it
 - 19 relates to the retirement commission?
 - 20 A. The retirement application requires that
 - any medical evidence within the last five years of
 - 22 whatever the incident or injury be received and
 - 23 reviewed.
 - 24 Q. And do you know in Mr. Kelley's case

- Q. Okay. And subsequent to this, do you
- recall any conversation you had with him as to any
- complaints as to benefits he was receiving under the
- retirement application that was approved?
- 5 A. Say that again.
- 6 Q. I'll try to. Subsequent to Exhibit 2,
- September 9, 2003, did you have any discussions with
- Mr. Kelley as to anything he was displeased about
- receiving certain benefits under the retirement that
- 10 was approved as you described on September 8?
- 11 A. Any benefits under the retirement?
- 12 Q. Right.
- 13 A. No, not under the retirement.
- 14 MR. SILVERFINE: Mark another document.
- 15 For the record, this was previously marked as
- 16 Exhibit 3 in Mr. Sacco's deposition on February 7,
- 17 2006. We'll also be, coincidentally, marking this
- 18 Exhibit 3 in your deposition.
- 19 (Exhibit 3 marked for identification)
- 20 Q. I'm going to put before you Exhibit 3 and
- 21 ask if you if you recognize that, first of all. Take
- your time. It's several pages.
- 23 A. It's a normal document that Mr. Sacco would
- 24 have produced for the Retirement Board.

Page 14 of 19

Page 49

- whether or not there was a review of his entire
- 2 medical history including five years prior to his
- injury suffered on May 25, 2003?
- A. Yes. That would have been sent to
- Mr. Sacco as well as being reviewed in the office by
- 6 myself.
- 7 Q. As far as you know, up until the time of
- 8 May 25, 2003, was Mr. Kelley going to work full-time?
- 9 A. As far as I know.
- 10 Q. Was he, as far as you knew, able to perform
- 11 the essential functions of the job of a police
- 12 officer for the Town of Plymouth up until his
- 13 incident of May 25, 2003?
- 14 A. As far as I know, yes.
- 15 Q. Any information you learned subsequent
- 16 that's not accurate?
- 17 A. No.
- 18 Q. So as far as you know and from the advice
- 19 of Counsel, this information, review of all the
- medical evidence, indicated that Mr. Kelley up until 20
- 21 May 25, 2003, was able to perform his duties as a
- 22 police officer?
- 23 A. That's correct.
- 24 Q. Page 2 of Exhibit 3 where it says,

1 Q. And, as well as you said medical

- 2 information including his medical information five
- years prior to May 25, 2003?
- A. Yes.
- 5 Q. As well as the medical panel's reports?
- 6 A. Right.

8

- 7 Q. As well as the opinion of Mr. Sacco, all
 - taken in together, you voted together to grant this?
- 9 A. That's correct.
- 10 Q. Just for the record, Mr. Kelley, did he
- 11 participate in this vote?
- 12 A. No, he could not.
- 13 Q. Was there any discussion because Mr. Kelley
- 14 was a sitting board member about any conflict of
- 15 interest any of the board members may have had?
- 16 A. The Board Counsel was there, and, you know,
- 17 counseled the Board that Mr. Kelley could not
- 18 participate in any part of that decision process, so
- 19 he had to recuse himself.
- 20 Q. But at the same point, just bear with me on
- 21 this, was there any discussion about the Board itself
- 22 having served with a fellow board member now ruling
- 23 on Mr. Kelley's application, was there any discussion
- 24 about any potential conflict the Board might have?

Page 50

- 1 "Conclusion and Vote," again, you based part of your conclusion and vote on the opinion of Mr. Sacco's 2
- 3 legal opinion, correct?
- A. Part.
- 5 Q. Right.
- 6 A. Yes, part.
- Q. That's my question.
- A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Also, as part of your findings here, "The
- 10 Board voted unanimously on September 5, 2003, to
- 11 apply Section 94 presumption and grant the accidental
- disability application of Thomas Kelley;" is that
- 13 fair to say?
- 14 A. That's correct.
- 15 Q. Then it says, "However, this grant is
- 16 subject to review by Perac;" is that fair to say?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. Once Perac approved, that's when you sent
- 19 the letter out, Exhibit 2?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. Again, this is based upon a review of the
- 22 medical information you had of his injury suffered
- 23 May 25, 2003?
- 24 A. Yes.

- 1 A. No, only that the Board wanted to make sure 2 that there would be -- that no one would be able to
- 3 make any kind of -- we had to do this so that there
- 4 would be no question.
- 5 Q. Did anyone express any concern, any
- 6 potential conflict, that the board members might have
- 7 in voting on a fellow board member's retirement
- 8 application?

- A. Potential conflict, no.
- 10 Q. Did you ever hear Mr. Kelley complain about
- 11 other police officers or officials going after him or
- 12 out to get him?
- 13 A. Any other police officers?
- 14 Q. Right.
- 15 A. Other than the ones we have spoken of?
- 16 Q. Tell me what your recollection is about
- 17 Mr. Kelley saying --
- 18 A. Just as I say, going after him as far as
- 19 having to recoup, the Retirement Board having to pay
- 20 for the time that he served on the Board. That's the
- 21 one time, the one that stands out in my memory.
- 22 Q. How long were these meetings, by the way?
- 23 A. They went all different times.
- 24 Q. Give me the range.

Page 53

- A. They could go to one hour to three hours,
- 2 it may be more, depending upon what the Board was
- taking up.
- 4 Q. This would be during the day, at night,
- 5 different times?
- A. The Board normally would meet during the
- 7 day.
- 8 Q. And you're aware Mr. Kellev's shift was
- 9 during the day?
- 10 A. I'm aware that Mr. Kelley's shift was .
- 11 during the day.
- 12 Q. That was why this whole issue of
- 13 reimbursement came up, fair to say, as far as you
- 14 know?
- 15 A. In his particular case, yes.
- 16 Q. How often did you meet - I know you told
- 17 us roughly the time frame, but how much did the Board
- 18 meet?
- 19 A. Well, the Board has to meet by law once a
- 20 month. Occasionally once a quarter the Board might
- 21 have an additional meeting for investments.
- 22 Q. Where would those meetings take place?
- 23 A. At Town Hall.
- 24 Q. Always at Town Hall?

Page 54

- 1 A. Normally all at Town Hall.
- 2 Q. Was there any other location you met?
- 3 A. There might be a different location. If we
- were doing investments, we might have come into the
- 5 consultant's office.
- 6 Q. When you say the "consultant's office,"
- 7 who's the consultant?
- 8 Kevin Leonard of Segal Advisors.
- 9 Q. Where are they?
- 10 A. Over on Huntington Avenue in Boston.
- 11 Q. Anywhere else you would meet?
- 12 A. No.
- 13 Q. Did you ever meet on Mr. Kelley's boat?
- 14
- 15 Q. Did you ever hear of any complaints from
- 16 any of Mr. Kelley's supervisors as to his work as a
- police officer?
- 18 A. No.
- 19 Q. Did you, yourself, have any issues with
- 20 Mr. Kelley's work as a Retirement Board member?
- 21
- 22 Q. Do you, yourself, know Chief Pomeroy,
- 23 Captain Botieri?
- A. I know who they are.

- Q. What is your relationship with either one
- 2 of them?

1

3

- A. Professional.
- 4 Q. Do you have any animosity toward Chief
- 5 Pomeroy or Captain Botieri?
- 6 A. No.
- 7 Q. And I may have asked you this before, but
- I'm just trying to kind of close some of the loops.
- Did Mr. Kelley himself ever tell you of any medical
- 10 condition he may have suffered from prior to May 25,
- 11
- 12 A. Again, not that I know of, not that I
- 13 remember, time lines here.
- 14 Q. Were you aware that the letter that we have
- 15 marked as an exhibit in this case would be attached
- 16 to Mr. Kelley's complaint filed against the Town of
- 17 Plymouth?
- 18 A. No.
- 19 Q. When did you learn that?
- 20 A. That this letter here (indicating)?
- 21 Q. Yes.

22

4

- A. Now.
- 23 Q. First time you're hearing of it?
- 24 A. That my letter is being used in this
 - Page 56

- 1 complaint, yes.
- 2 Q. Never had any discussion with Mr. Kelley,
- 3 words to the effect, "I'm going to use your letter"?
 - A. Not that I recall.
- 5 Q. Okay.
- 6 MR. SILVERFINE: I have nothing further at
- 7 this time. Counsel?
- 8 MR. GALLITANO: Just a couple of questions.
 - **EXAMINATION**
- 10 BY MR. GALLITANO:
- 11 Q. Ms. Sullivan, we'll try and get you out of
- 12 here. To clarify a couple of things, in your
- 13 testimony earlier, you said that you first met
- 14 Mr. Kelley when he came on the Board; is that
- 15 correct?
- 16 A. That's correct.
- 17 Q. And in your earlier testimony today, you
- 18 mentioned the year 1986; did you misspeak?
- 19 A. Yes. I wasn't working for the Town at that
- 20 time.
- 21 Q. You meant 1996?
- 22 A. Correct.
- 23 Q. Just thought we would clear that up. The
- 24 behavior of Peter Flynn, was his behavior you were

Ρ	a	a	е	5	7

- describing to describe one he was being rude and
- 2 obnoxious?
- 3 A. Yes.
- Q. Was he ever belligerent in his attitude
- towards the Board?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Was he belligerent to the staff?
- A. Yes.
- Q. You say Mr. Kelley had a had a problem with
- 10 him. Was that Mr. Kelley was coming to the defense
- of the staff members?
- 12 MR. SILVERFINE: Objection to the form.
- 13 A. Yes.

16

- 14 Q. If Mr. Kelley had a problem, did he express
- 15 what his problem was with Mr. Flynn?

A. That he shouldn't speak to the retirement

- 17 staff in that manner, that he had no right to talk to
- 18 us in that way.
- 19 Q. But other than that, did Mr. Kelley have
- any other grievances with Mr. Flynn?
- 21 MR. SILVERFINE: Objection to the form.
- 22 A. I don't believe so.
- 23 Q. Do you know if Mr. Kelley and Mr. Flynn had
- 24 any contact prior to that?

- belongs to any particular budget of a town department
- is still the Town's money; is it not?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. So if we're charging back money from one
- budget to another budget, it's still the Town's money
- being shifted from one location to the other
- 7 location?
- 8 A. No, not in regards to the retirement
- 9 system. The retirement system is a separate entity
- 10 from the Town.
- 11 Q. But the other town employees, so if a town
- 12 employee, for instance -- you mentioned it was
- 13 Mr. Manfredi serves on the Board?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. He's the building commissioner, correct?
- 16 A. Yes. Thank you.
- 17 Q. So the building commissioner works for the
- 18 building department?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. Now, as a separate department, would that
- 21 have its own budget?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. So did you ever receive a request from the
- 24 building department to have for reimbursement of

Page 58

- 1 A. Not that I'm aware of.
- 2 Q. In your letter, which is Exhibit 1, I
- believe, if I could direct your attention to the last
- paragraph where it says, "It's been my experience
- since 1991," and in that paragraph you make mention,
- you refer to other board members, and you also
- testified there were other board members who were
- town employees; is that correct?
- 9 A. That's right.
- 10 Q. The other board members that were town
- 11 employees came from different departments; is that
- 12 correct?
- 13 A. That's right.
- 14 Q. Now, each department has its own budget?
- 15 A. That's right.
- 16 Q. But there is an annual budget for the
- 17 entire Town, correct?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. So in a sense, the money that's in each of
- 20 these individual budgets derives from a total annual
- 21 budget?
- 22 A. I'm not aware as to how that whole thing
- 23 works together.
- 24 Q. Let's put it this way: The money that

- 1 Mr. Manfredi's time spent on the Board?
- 2 A. No.
- 3 Q. To Mr. Dello Russo you mentioned was the
- exofficio member; is that correct?
- 5 A. That's correct.
- 6 Q. And he was, also, held another position in
- the Town besides being on the Retirement Board?
- 8 A. That's correct.
- 9 Q. What was that again?
- 10 A. The finance director.
- 11 Q. As finance director he came out of the
- 12 finance department; isn't that so?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. Did you ever receive any request from the
- 15 finance department for a charge back to cover his
- time on the Board? 16
- 17 A. No.
- 18 Q. So in your experience, the only time -
- 19 strike that.
- 20 In your experience, was there any
- 21 other occasion when any member who happened to be a
- 22 town employee serving on the Retirement Board had to
- 23 have his time charged back from his department to be
- 24 reimbursed?

1 A. Not during my tenure, no. 2 Q. That would be from 1991 to present, 3 corner? 4 A. That's right. 5 Q. You mentioned you had heard of some 6 disturbance or some argument between Mr. Kelley and 7 Officer Botieri; is hat correct? 8 A. That's right. 9 Q. Were you there? 10 A. No, I wasn't. 11 Q. So you didn't witness anything? 12 A. No. 13 Q. So you that witness anything? 13 A. No. 14 occurred or who said what to anyone? 15 A. No. 16 Q. The matter of the 111F benefits, have you that head blook types of situations before, where someone is injured on-duty and does not receive 111F benefits? You had said in your previous testimony until it's actually ruled by — that he's been retired based on an injury on duty; is that correct? 10 A. Two rulings? 11 A. Two rulings? 12 Q. Yes, one on the presumption and one as to actual injury on-duty? 12 A. Two rulings? 13 A. VI, I think, is an ordinary disability and 49 4is the presumption. 15 Q. But what I'm saying is — 16 A. Oka, I'm sorry. 17 Q. What I'm trying to ascertain is, that in submission of his application and also the ruling by the medical panel, did they not, in fact, rule that it was an injury on-duty that caused his retirement? 14 A. Yes. 15 A. No. 16 Q. The matter of the 111F benefits, have you thing the actually ruled by — that he's been retired based on an injury on duty; is that correct? 18 A. Two rulings? 2 Q. Yes, one on the presumption and one as to actual injury on-duty? 2 A. No—well, I'm not sure. It was voted that he retired under Section 7 under the presumption law. 2 A. No—well, I'm not sure. It was voted that he retired under Section 7 under the presumption law where it says, paragraph, "Conclusion and Vote" and where it says, paragraph, "Conclu			-	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
2 Q. Right. 3 correct? 4 A. That's right. 5 Q. You mentioned you had heard of some disturbance or some argument between Mr. Kelley and Officer Botleri; is that correct? 8 A. That's right. 9 Q. Were you there? 10 A. No, I wasn't. 11 Q. So you didn't witness anything? 11 Q. So you have no firsthand knowledge of what occurred or who said what to anyone? 11 A. No. I wasn't. 12 A. No. 13 Q. So you have no firsthand knowledge of what occurred or who said what to anyone? 14 handled those types of situations before, where someone is injured on-duty and does not receive 111F benefits? You had said in your previous testimony util it's actually ruled by — that he's been retired based on an injury on duty; is that correct? 2 A. Presumption cases specifically. 2 Q. Were there two rulings in Mr. Kelley's case? Page 62 A. Two rulings? Q. Yes, one on the presumption and one as to a actual injury on-duty? 4 A. No — well, Tm not sure. It was voted that he retired under Section 7 under the presumption, just a ballpark; could you hear he sesential duties and paragraph, "Conclusion and Vote" and where it says, a "The Board also concluded that Kelley's permanent inability to perform the essential duties and paragraph, "Conclusion and Vote" and where it says, a "The Board also concluded that Kelley's permanent inability to perform the essential duties and positions the proximal result of the personal injury he anaratied May 25, 2003, while in performance of his duties." Page 62 A. Yes. Page 62 A. That's right. 9 Q. Were there two rulings in Mr. Kelley's permanent inability to perform the essential duties and positions the proximal result of the personal injury on-duty? A. Yes, and that it, also, based on the medical panel, did they with a fact, rule that it was an injury on-duty in the beginning of the paragraph when you unemtioned, second line, accompanying the narrative report and medical 20 Purther up in the beginning of the paragraph when you mentioned, second line, accompanying the narrative report and medical		Page 61		Page 63
2 Q. Right. 3 correct? 4 A. That's right. 5 Q. You mentioned you had heard of some 6 disturbance or some argument between Mr. Kelley and 7 Officer Botier; is that correct? 8 A. That's right. 9 Q. Were you there? 1 A. No, I wasn't. 11 Q. So you didn't witness anything? 12 A. No. 13 Q. So you have no firsthand knowledge of what 14 coccurred or who said what to anyone? 15 A. No. 16 Q. The matter of the 111F benefits, have you 17 handled those types of situations before, where 18 someone is injured on-duty and does not receive 111F 19 benefits? You had said in your previous testimony 20 until it's actually ruled by – that he's been 21 retired based on an injury on duty; is that correct? 22 A. Presumption cases specifically. 23 Q. Were there two rulings in Mr. Kelley's 24 case? Page 62 1 A. Two rulings? 2 Q. Yes, one on the presumption and one as to 3 actual injury on-duty? 4 A. No – well, I'm not sure. It was voted 5 that he retired under Section 7 under the presumption 6 law. 9 paragraph, "Conclusion and Vote" and where it says, 10 "The Board also concluded that Kelley's permanent 11 inability to perform the essential duties and 12 positions the proximal result of the personal injury 13 he sustained May 25, 2003, while in performance of 14 his duties." 15 A. Yes. And that is, also, based on the 16 medical panel, did they work in submission of his application and also the ruling by 11 the medical panel, did they not, in fact, rule that 12 positions the proximation and some as to 13 also applied? 14 A. Yes. 15 Mr. SACCO: I want to clarify a couple of 17 points to make sure it's clear for the record. 18 EXAMINATION 19 PY MR. SACCO: 20 Q. Ms. Sullivan, when you were hired in 1991 21 and you testified that – I think Exhibit 2 indicates 22 Mr. Kelley coming on the Board in Decomber 1996, st 23 when you were hired by the Board, Mr. Kelley was no 24 on the Board also concluded that Kelley's permanent 25 positions the proximal result of the personal injury 26 positions the proximal result of the personal injury 27 positi	1	A. Not during my tenure, no.	1.	disability?
3	2	Q. That would be from 1991 to present,	2	•
4 A. That's right. 5 Q. You mentioned you had heard of some disturbance or some argument between Mr. Kelley and officer Botieri; is that correct? 8 A. That's right. 9 Q. Were you there? 10 A. No, I wasn't. 11 Q. So you didn't witness anything? 12 A. No. 13 Q. So you have no firsthand knowledge of what of courred or who said what to anyone? 15 A. No. 16 Q. The matter of the 111F benefits, have you had heard to see in signized on-duty and does not receive 111F benefits? You had said in your previous testimony 20 until it's actually ruled by — that he's been 21 retired based on an injury on duty; is that correct? 12 A. Presumption cases specifically. 13 Q. Were there two rulings in Mr. Kelley's 24 case? 14 A. Two rulings? 25 Q. Yes, one on the presumption and one as to actual injury on-duty? 26 A. No — well, Tru not sure. It was voted that he retired under Section 7 under the presumption alway need to that he retired under Section 7 under the presumption and population and Vote' and where it says, or The Board also concluded that Kelley's permanent inability to perform the essential duties and 22 positions the proximal result of the personal injury 1 he sustained May 25, 2003, while in performance of his duties." 15 A. Yes. And that is, also, based on the medical panel, did they not, in fact, rule that in the vision of his application and also the ruling by the them edical panel, did they not, in fact, rule that in the value proposed of what to anyone? 16 A. No. 17 Were there of the 111F benefits, have you have the presumption as the proximal result of the personal injury have you were hired by the Board, Mr. Kelley was no on the Board at that time you were hired; is that orrect? 2 A. That's correct? 2 A. That's correct. 3 Q. In terms of, and I think Mr. Gallitano appropriate a Sp, are you aware of 10 metric funder the presumption, just a ballpark; could you have the retired under the presumption, just a ballpark; could you have the retired under the presumption was not granted 111F benefits? 4 A. The most	3	correct?	3	
5 Q. You mentioned you had heard of some 6 disturbance or some argument between Mr. Kelley and 7 Officer Botien; is that correct? 8 A. That's right. 9 Q. Were you there? 10 A. No, I wasn't. 11 Q. So you didn't witness anything? 12 A. No. 13 Q. So you didn't witness anything? 14 occurred or who said what to anyone? 15 A. No. 16 Q. The matter of the 111F benefits, have you 17 handled those types of situations before, where 18 someone is injured on-duty and does not receive 111F 19 benefits? You had said in your previous testimony 20 until it's actually ruled by — that he's been 21 retired based on an injury on duty; is that correct? 22 A. Presumption cases specifically. 23 Q. Were there two rulings in Mr. Kelley's 24 case? Page 62 1 A. Two rulings? 2 Q. Yes, one on the presumption and one as to actual injury on-duty? 4 A. No — well, I'm not sure. It was voted that he retired under Section 7 under the presumption law.	4	A. That's right.	4	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
6 disturbance or some argument between Mr. Kelley and 7 Officer Botieri; is that correct? 8 A. That's right. 9 Q. Were you there? 10 A. No, I wasn't. 11 Q. So you didn't witness anything? 12 A. No. 13 Q. So you have no firsthand knowledge of what 14 occurred or who said what to anyone? 15 A. No. 16 Q. The matter of the 111F benefits, have you 17 handled those types of situations before, where 18 someone is injured on-duty and does not receive 111F 19 benefits? You had said in your previous testimony 20 until it's actually ruled by - that he's been 10 retired based on an injury on duty; is that correct? 11 A. Two rulings? 12 Q. Yes, one on the presumption and one as to actual injury on-duty? 13 handled that her teired under Section 7 under the presumption law. 15 A. Two rulings? 16 A. Two rulings? 17 Q. What I'm trying to ascertain is, that in 18 submission of his application and also the ruling by 16 the medical panel, did they not, in fact, rule that 16 it was an injury on-duty that caused his retirement? 17 A. Yes. 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. And in addition, the presumption law was 19 A. Yes. 10 A. Yes. 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. And in addition, the presumption law was 11 also applied? 12 A. Yes. 13 MR. GALLITANO: No further questions. 14 B. EXAMINATION 15 BYMR. SACCO: I want to clarify a couple of points to make sure it's clear for the record. 18 EXAMINATION 19 BYMR. SACCO: 20 Q. Ms. Sullivan, when you were hired in 1991 21 and you testified that — I think Exhibit 2 indicates 22 Mr. Kelley coming on the Board in December 1996, st. 23 when you were hired by the Board, Mr. Kelley was no or the Board in December 1996, st. 24 case? 25 A. That's correct. 26 Q. In terms of, and I think Mr. Gallitano approached this, in your experience as Board 27 Director, how many individuals do you think you have retired under the presumption, just a ballpark; could you have a presumption was not granted 111F benefits? 28 A. Yes. 29 Q. Of those approached this, in your experience as Board 29 positions the proximate 35, are you aware of any other i	5	Q. You mentioned you had heard of some	5	
7 Officer Botieri; is that correct? 8 A. Thar's right. 9 Q. Were you there? 10 A. No, I wasn't. 11 Q. So you didn't witness anything? 12 A. No. 13 Q. So you have no firsthand knowledge of what occurred or who said what to anyone? 14 occurred or who said what to anyone? 15 A. No. 16 Q. The matter of the 111F benefits, have you handled those types of situations before, where someone is injured on-duty and does not receive 111F benefits? You had said in your previous testimony until it's actually ruled by — that he's been retired based on an injury on duty; is that correct? 17 extended that he retreate who rulings in Mr. Kelley's case? Page 62 A. Two rulings? Q. Yes, one on the presumption and one as to actual injury on-duty? A. No — well, Tm not sure. It was voted that he retried under Section 7 under the presumption law. Page 62 A. That's cright. 8 submission of his application and also the ruling by the was in ijury or-duty that caused his retirement? 1. A. Yes. 1. Q. And in addition, the presumption law was an approached this presumption law was a pipitor? 1. A. Yes. 1. MR. GALLITANO: No further questions. 1. MR. SACCO: I want to clarify a couple of MR. SACCO:	6	disturbance or some argument between Mr. Kelley and	6	
8 submission of his application and also the ruling by the medical panel, did they not, in fact, rule that 10 it was an injury on-duty that caused his retirement? 11 A. No. 1 wasnt. 12 Q. So you have no firsthand knowledge of what occurred or who said what to anyone? 13 A. No. 20. The matter of the 111F benefits, have you 14 handled those types of situations before, where 16 someone is injured on-duty and does not receive 111F somefits? You had said in your previous testimony 17 benefits? You had said in your previous testimony 18 benefits? You had said in your previous testimony 19 until it's actually ruled by - that he's been 19 retired based on an injury on duty; is that correct? 19 case? 19 A. Presumption cases specifically. 19 Q. Were there two rulings in Mr. Kelley's 19 case? 19 Q. Yes, one on the presumption and one as to 19 actual injury on-duty? 19 and you testified that - I think Exhibit 2 indicates 19 when you were hired based on an injury on duty; is that correct? 19 Work SACCO: 1 want to clearly a couple of points to make sure it's clear for the record. 19 by MR. SACCO: 1 want to clarify a couple of points to make sure it's clear for the record. 19 by MR. SACCO: 1 want to clarify a couple of points to make sure it's clear for the record. 19 by MR. SACCO: 1 want to clarify a couple of points to make sure it's clear for the record. 19 by MR. SACCO: 1 want to clarify a couple of points to make sure it's clear for the record. 19 by MR. SACCO: 1 want to clarify a couple of points to make sure it's clear for the record. 19 by MR. SACCO: 10 want to clarify a couple of points to make sure it's clear for the record. 19 by MR. SACCO: 1 want to clarify a couple of points to make sure it's clear for the record. 19 by MR. SACCO: 10 want to clarify a couple of points to make sure it's clear for the record. 19 by MR. SACCO: 1 want to clarify a couple of points to make sure it's clear for the record. 19 by MR. SACCO: 10 want to larify a couple of points to make sure it's clear for the record. 19 by MR. SACCO: 10 w	7	Officer Botieri; is that correct?	7	-
9 (Were you there? 10 A. No, I wasn't. 11 Q. So you didn't witness anything? 12 A. No. 13 Q. So you have no firsthand knowledge of what 14 occurred or who said what to anyone? 15 A. No. 16 Q. The matter of the 111F benefits, have you 17 handled those types of situations before, where 18 someone is injured on-duty and does not receive 111F 19 benefits? You had said in your previous testimony 20 until it's actually ruled by — that he's been 21 retired based on an injury on duty; is that correct? 22 A. Presumption cases specifically. 23 Q. Were there two rulings in Mr. Kelley's 24 case? Page 62 1 A. Two rulings? Q. Yes, one on the presumption and one as to actual injury on-duty? 4 A. No — well, I'm not sure. It was voted 5 that he retired under Section 7 under the presumption 6 law. Page 62 1 The Board also concluded that Kelley's permanent 10 The Board also concluded that Kelley's permanent 11 inability to perform the essential duties and 12 positions the proximal result of the personal injury 13 he sustained May 25, 2003, while in performance of 14 his duties. Page 10 Were there two public in performance of 15 A. Yes. Q. A. That's correct. Q. In terms of, and I think Mr. Gallitano approached this, in your experience as Board Director, how many individuals do you think you have retired under the presumption, just a ballpark; could you hazard a guess? A. In my time, ch, 35, maybe. Q. Of those approximate 35, are you awane of any other individual who once they retired under the presumption was not granted 111F benefits? A. Then not aware of any. MR. SACCO: A. That's correct. A. That's correct. A. That's correct. A. That's correct. A. In my time, ch, 35, maybe. Q. Of those approximate 35, are you awane of any other individual who once they retired under the presumption was not granted 111F benefits? A. In mot aware of any. MR. SACCO: A. In my time, ch, 35, maybe. Q. Of those approximate 35, are you awane of any other individual who once they retired under the presumption was concluded at 12:40 p.m.)	8	A. That's right.	8	
10 it was an injury on-duty that caused his retirement? 11 Q. So you didn't witness anything? 12 A. No. 13 Q. So you have no firsthand knowledge of what 14 occurred or who said what to anyone? 15 A. No. 16 Q. The matter of the 111F benefits, have you 17 handled those types of situations before, where 18 someone is injured on-duty and does not receive 111F 19 benefits? You had said in your previous testimony 20 until it's actually ruled by — that he's been 21 retired based on an injury on duty; is that correct? 22 A. Presumption cases specifically. 23 Q. Were there two rulings in Mr. Kelley's 24 case? Page 62 1 A. Two rulings? 2 Q. Yes, one on the presumption and one as to 3 actual injury on-duty? 4 A. No. Page 62 1 A. Two rulings? 2 Q. Yes, one on the presumption and one as to 3 actual injury on-duty? 4 A. No. Page 62 1 A. Two rulings? 2 Q. Yes, one on the presumption and one as to 4 actual injury on-duty? 4 A. No. Page 62 1 A. Two rulings? 2 Q. Yes, one on the presumption and one as to 4 actual injury on-duty? 4 A. No. Would you refer to Exhibit 3, second page, last 5 paragraph, "Conclusion and Vote" and where it says, 9 positions the proximal result of the personal injury 13 he sustained May 25, 2003, while in performance of 14 his duties." 5 A. Yes. And that is, also, based on the 16 medical panel, that the doctors, the physicians, have 17 determined. 18 C. Further up in the beginning of the 19 paragraph when you mentioned, second line, 20 accompanying the narrative report and medical	9	Q. Were you there?	9	
11 Q. So you didn't witness anything? 12 A. No. 13 Q. So you have no firsthand knowledge of what 14 occurred or who said what to anyone? 15 A. No. 16 Q. The matter of the 111F benefits, have you 17 handled those types of situations before, where 18 someone is injured on-duty and does not receive 111F 19 benefits? You had said in your previous testimony 20 until it's actually ruled by — that he's been 21 rettred based on an injury on duty; is that correct? 22 A. Presumption cases specifically. 23 Q. Were there two rulings in Mr. Kelley's 24 case? Page 62 Page 62 A. Two rulings? 2 Q. Yes, one on the presumption and one as to actual injury on-duty? 4 A. No — well, I'm not sure. It was voted that he retired under Section 7 under the presumption 1 law. Page 62 A. Two rulings? 2 Q. Let me try and refresh your recollection. 3 Would you refer to Exhibit 3, second page, last paragraph, "Conclusion and Vote" and where it says, or "The Board also concluded that Kelley's permanent iniability to perform the essential duties and positions the proximal result of the personal injury 13 he sustained May 25, 2003, while in performance of that he citied under the determined. 14 No. Yes. 15 A. Yes. 16 MR. GALLITANO: No further questions. MR. SACCO: want to clarify a couple of points to make sure it's clear for the record. EXAMINATION 19 BY MR. SACCO: 20 Q. Ms. Sullivan, when you were hired in 1991 21 and you testified that — I think Exhibit 2 indicates 22 Mr. Kelley coming on the Board in December 1996, st when you were hired by the Board, Mr. Kelley was no on the Board at that time you were hired; is that 10 Correct? A. That's correct. 3 Q. In terms of, and I think Mr. Gallitano 4 approached this, in your experience as Board 5 Director, how many individuals do you think you have retired under the presumption, just a ballpark; could 7 you hazard a guess? A. In my time, oh, 35, maybe. Q. Of those approximate 35, are you aware of any. MR. SACCO: Thank you. MR. SACCO: Thank you. MR. SACCO: Thank you. Where there to	10	A. No, I wasn't.	10	
2. So you have no firsthand knowledge of what coccurred or who said what to anyone? A. No. 2. The matter of the 111F benefits, have you 1. The Board also concluded that Kelley's 2. Were the retired under Section 7 under the presumption law. A. No - well, I'm not sure. It was voted that he retired under Section 7 under the presumption law. Would you refer to Exhibit 3, second page, last paragraph, "Conclusion and Vote" and where it says, positions the proximal result of the personal injury 1. A. Yes. 1. A. Two rulings? Q. Let me try and refresh your recollection. Would you refer to Exhibit 3, second page, last paragraph, "Conclusion and Vote" and where it says, positions the proximal result of the personal injury 1. B sustained May 25, 2003, while in performance of the medical panel, that the doctors, the physicians, have determined. A. Yes. MR. GALLITANO: No further questions. MR. SACCO: I want to clarify a couple of points to make sure it's clear for the record. EXAMINATION 18 MR. SACCO: MR. Sallivan, when you were hired in 1991 21 and you testified that – I think Exhibit 2 indicates MR. Kelley coming on the Board in December 1996, so when you were hired by the Board, Mr. Kelley was no on the Board at 1 1 think Exhibit 2 indicates MR. Kelley coming on the Board in 1991 22 A. That's correct. 3 Correct? A. That's correct. 3 Q. In terms of, and I think Mr. Gallitano approached this, in your experience as Board 5 Director, how many individuals do you think you have retired under the presumption, just a ballpark; could you have retired under the presumption was not granted 111F benefits? A. I'm not aware of any. MR. SACCO: A. That's correct. Q. In terms of, and I think Mr. Gallitano approached this, in your experience as Board Director, how many individuals do you think you have retired under the presumption was not granted 111F benefits? A. I'm not aware of any. MR. SACCO: A. That's correct. Q. Of those approximate	11	Q. So you didn't witness anything?	11	
Q. So you have no firsthand knowledge of what cocurred or who said what to anyone? A. No. 16 Q. The matter of the 111F benefits, have you 17 handled those types of situations before, where 18 someone is injured on-duty and does not receive 111F 19 benefits? You had said in your previous testimony 20 until it's actually ruled by that he's been 21 retired based on an injury on duty; is that correct? 22 A. Presumption cases specifically. 23 Q. Were there two rulings in Mr. Kelley's 24 case? Page 62 Page 62 A. Two rulings? Q. Yes, one on the presumption and one as to actual injury on-duty? A. No well, I'm not sure. It was voted that he retired under Section 7 under the presumption law. Q. Let me try and refresh your recollection. Would you refer to Exhibit 3, second page, last paragraph, "Conclusion and Vote" and where it says, 10 "The Board also concluded that Kelley's permannet 11 inability to perform the essential duties and 12 positions the proximal result of the personal injury 13 he sustained May 25, 2003, while in performance of 16 his duties." A. Yes. MR. SACCO: I want to clarify a couple of points to make sure it's clear for the record. EXAMINATION BYMR. SACCO: Q. Ms. Sullivan, when you were hired in 1991 and you testified that I think Exhibit 2 indicates Wr. Kelley coming on the Board in December 1996, se and the Heave on the Board at that time you were hired by the Board, Mr. Kelley was no on the Board at that time you were hired by the Board, Mr. Kelley was no on the Board at that time you were hired by the Board, Mr. Kelley was no on the Board at that time you were hired in 1991 and you testified that I think Exhibit 2 indicates 10 on the Board at 10 the Board in December 1996, se when you were hired by the Board, Mr. Kelley was no on the Board at that time you were hired in 1991 21 correct? A. That's correct. 32 Q. In terms of, and I think Mr. Gallitano approached this, in your experience as Board 43 Director, how many individuals do you think you have of the dermined of th	12	A. No.	12	Q. And in addition, the presumption law was
14 Occurred or who said what to anyone? A. No. Q. The matter of the 111F benefits, have you 16 handled those types of situations before, where someone is injured on-duty and does not receive 111F benefits? You had said in your previous testimony until it's actually ruled by — that he's been 20 until it's actually ruled by — that he's been 21 retired based on an injury on duty; is that correct? 22 A. Presumption cases specifically. 23 Q. Were there two rulings in Mr. Kelley's 24 case? Page 62 1 A. Two rulings? 2 Q. Yes, one on the presumption and one as to 3 actual injury on-duty? 4 A. No — well, I'm not sure. It was voted 4 that he retired under Section 7 under the presumption alaw. Q. Let me try and refresh your recollection. Would you refer to Exhibit 3, second page, last paragraph, "Conclusion and Vote" and where it says, paragraph, "Conclusion and Vote" and where it says, positions the proximal result of the personal injury 17 he board also concluded that Kelley's permanent inability to perform the essential duties and 22 positions the proximal result of the personal injury 18 he sustained May 25, 2003, while in performance of 4 his duties." A. Yes. And that is, also, based on the medical panel, that the doctors, the physicians, have determined. Q. Further up in the begimning of the paragraph when you mentioned, second line, 20 accompanying the narrative report and medical	13	Q. So you have no firsthand knowledge of what	13	
Q. The matter of the 111F benefits, have you handled those types of situations before, where someone is injured on-duty and does not receive 111F benefits? You had said in your previous testimony until it's actually ruled by — that he's been retired based on an injury on duty; is that correct? A. Presumption cases specifically. Q. Were there two rulings in Mr. Kelley's case? Page 62 A. Two rulings? Q. Yes, one on the presumption and one as to actual injury on-duty? A. No — well, Tm not sure. It was voted that he retired under Section 7 under the presumption law. Q. Let me try and refresh your recollection. Would you refer to Exhibit 3, second page, last paragraph, "Conclusion and Vote" and where it says, "The Board also concluded that Kelley's permanent inability to perform the essential duties and positions the proximal result of the personal injury shifts be untilly to perform the essential duties and positions the proximal result of the personal injury shifts be ustained May 25, 2003, while in performance of his duties." A. Yes. And that is, also, based on the medical panel, that the doctors, the physicians, have determined. Q. Further up in the beginning of the paragraph when you mentioned, second line, accompanying the narrative report and medical	14		14	
Q. The matter of the 111F benefits, have you handled those types of situations before, where someone is injured on-duty and does not receive 111F benefits? You had said in your previous testimony until it's actually ruled by — that he's been retired based on an injury on duty; is that correct? A. Presumption cases specifically. Q. Were there two rulings in Mr. Kelley's case? Page 62 A. Two rulings? Q. Yes, one on the presumption and one as to actual injury on-duty? A. No — well, I'm not sure. It was voted that he retired under Section 7 under the presumption ad that he retired under Section 7 under the presumption would you refer to Exhibit 3, second page, last paragraph, "Conclusion and Vote" and where it says, 10 "The Board also concluded that Kelley's permanent inability to perform the essential duties and positions the proximal result of the personal injury his duties." A. Yes. And that is, also, based on the medical panel, that the doctors, the physicians, have determined. Q. Further up in the beginning of the paragraph when you mentioned, second line, 20 accompanying the narrative report and medical	15	A. No.	15	MR. GALLITANO: No further questions.
handled those types of situations before, where someone is injured on-duty and does not receive 111F benefits? You had said in your previous testimony until it's actually ruled by — that he's been retired based on an injury on duty; is that correct? A. Presumption cases specifically. Q. Were there two rulings in Mr. Kelley's A. Two rulings? Q. Yes, one on the presumption and one as to actual injury on-duty? A. No — well, I'm not sure. It was voted that he retired under Section 7 under the presumption law. Q. Let me try and refresh your recollection. Would you refer to Exhibit 3, second page, last paragraph, "Conclusion and Vote" and where it says, paragraph, "Conclusion and Vote" and where it says, possitions the proximal result of the personal injury he sustained May 25, 2003, while in performance of this duties." A. Yes. And that is, also, based on the medical panel, that the doctors, the physicians, have determined. Q. Further up in the beginning of the paragraph when you mentioned, second line, accompanying the narrative report and medical	16	Q. The matter of the 111F benefits, have you	16	
someone is injured on-duty and does not receive 111F benefits? You had said in your previous testimony until it's actually ruled by that he's been retired based on an injury on duty; is that correct? A. Presumption cases specifically. Q. Were there two rulings in Mr. Kelley's case? Page 62 A. Two rulings? Q. Yes, one on the presumption and one as to actual injury on-duty? A. No well, I'm not sure. It was voted that he retired under Section 7 under the presumption ablaw. Q. Let me try and refresh your recollection. Would you refer to Exhibit 3, second page, last paragraph, "Conclusion and Vote" and where it says, 10 "The Board also concluded that Kelley's permanent inability to perform the essential duties and 2 positions the proximal result of the personal injury 13 he sustained May 25, 2003, while in performance of determined. A. Yes. And that is, also, based on the medical panel, that the doctors, the physicians, have determined. Q. Further up in the beginning of the paragraph when you mentioned, second line, 20 accompanying the narrative report and medical	17		17	
19 benefits? You had said in your previous testimony until it's actually ruled by — that he's been retired based on an injury on duty; is that correct? 2 A. Presumption cases specifically. 2 Q. Were there two rulings in Mr. Kelley's 2 do not the Board in December 1996, so when you were hired by the Board, Mr. Kelley was no on the Board at that time you were hired; is that Page 62 A. Two rulings? Q. Yes, one on the presumption and one as to actual injury on-duty? A. No — well, I'm not sure. It was voted that he retired under Section 7 under the presumption law. Q. Let me try and refresh your recollection. Would you refer to Exhibit 3, second page, last paragraph, "Conclusion and Vote" and where it says, 10 "The Board also concluded that Kelley's permanent inability to perform the essential duties and positions the proximal result of the personal injury 13 he sustained May 25, 2003, while in performance of determined. A. Yes. And that is, also, based on the medical panel, that the doctors, the physicians, have determined. Q. Further up in the beginning of the paragraph when you mentioned, second line, 20 accompanying the narrative report and medical	18	someone is injured on-duty and does not receive 111F	18	
20 until it's actually ruled by — that he's been retired based on an injury on duty; is that correct? 2 A. Presumption cases specifically. 2 Q. Were there two rulings in Mr. Kelley's case? Page 62 A. Two rulings? Q. Yes, one on the presumption and one as to actual injury on-duty? A. No — well, I'm not sure. It was voted that he retired under Section 7 under the presumption law. Q. Let me try and refresh your recollection. Would you refer to Exhibit 3, second page, last paragraph, "Conclusion and Vote" and where it says, in "The Board also concluded that Kelley's permanent iniability to perform the essential duties and positions the proximal result of the personal injury his duties." A. Yes, And that is, also, based on the medical panel, that the doctors, the physicians, have determined. Q. Further up in the beginning of the paragraph when you mentioned, second line, accompanying the narrative report and medical	19	benefits? You had said in your previous testimony	19	•
21 retired based on an injury on duty; is that correct? 22 A. Presumption cases specifically. 23 Q. Were there two rulings in Mr. Kelley's 24 case? Page 62 1 A. Two rulings? 2 Q. Yes, one on the presumption and one as to actual injury on-duty? 4 A. No well, I'm not sure. It was voted that he retired under Section 7 under the presumption law. 6 law. 7 Q. Let me try and refresh your recollection. 8 Would you refer to Exhibit 3, second page, last paragraph, "Conclusion and Vote" and where it says, 10 "The Board also concluded that Kelley's permanent inability to perform the essential duties and positions the proximal result of the personal injury 13 he sustained May 25, 2003, while in performance of the inability and the presument of the determined. 18 Q. Further up in the beginning of the paragraph when you mentioned, second line, 20 accompanying the narrative report and medical and you testified that I think Exhibit 2 indicates Mr. Kelley coming on the Board in December 1996, so when you were hired by the Board, Mr. Kelley was no on the Board at that time you were hired; is that 22 Mr. Kelley coming on the Board in December 1996, so when you were hired by the Board, Mr. Kelley was no on the Board at that time you were hired; is that Page 6: Correct? A. That's correct. 3 Q. In terms of, and I think Mr. Gallitano approached this, in your experience as Board Director, how many individuals do you think you have retired under the presumption, just a ballpark; could you hazard a guess? A. In my time, oh, 35, maybe. Q. Of those approximate 35, are you aware of any other individual who once they retired under the presumption was not granted 111F benefits? A. I'm not aware of any. MR. SACCO: Thank you. MR. SACCO: Thank you. MR. SACCO: Thank you. (Whereupon, the deposition was concluded at 12:40 p.m.)	20		20	Q. Ms. Sullivan, when you were hired in 1991
A. Presumption cases specifically. Q. Were there two rulings in Mr. Kelley's Page 62 A. Two rulings? Q. Yes, one on the presumption and one as to actual injury on-duty? A. No well, I'm not sure. It was voted that he retired under Section 7 under the presumption law. Q. Let me try and refresh your recollection. Would you refer to Exhibit 3, second page, last paragraph, "Conclusion and Vote" and where it says, pragraphable bear and positions the proximal result of the personal injury last sustained May 25, 2003, while in performance of this duties." A. Yes. And that is, also, based on the medical panel, that the doctors, the physicians, have determined. Q. Further up in the beginning of the paragraph when you mentioned, second line, accompanying the narrative report and medical	21	retired based on an injury on duty; is that correct?	21	
Q. Were there two rulings in Mr. Kelley's Page 62 A. Two rulings? Q. Yes, one on the presumption and one as to actual injury on-duty? A. No well, I'm not sure. It was voted that he retired under Section 7 under the presumption law. Q. Let me try and refresh your recollection. Would you refer to Exhibit 3, second page, last paragraph, "Conclusion and Vote" and where it says, 10 "The Board also concluded that Kelley's permanent inability to perform the essential duties and positions the proximal result of the personal injury 13 he sustained May 25, 2003, while in performance of this duties." A. Yes. And that is, also, based on the medical panel, that the doctors, the physicians, have determined. Q. Further up in the beginning of the paragraph when you mentioned, second line, 20 accompanying the narrative report and medical	22	A. Presumption cases specifically.	22	
Page 62 A. Two rulings? Q. Yes, one on the presumption and one as to actual injury on-duty? A. No well, I'm not sure. It was voted that he retired under Section 7 under the presumption law. Q. Let me try and refresh your recollection. Would you refer to Exhibit 3, second page, last paragraph, "Conclusion and Vote" and where it says, "The Board also concluded that Kelley's permanent inability to perform the essential duties and positions the proximal result of the personal injury he sustained May 25, 2003, while in performance of his duties." A. Yes. And that is, also, based on the medical panel, that the doctors, the physicians, have determined. Page 62 Correct? A. That's correct. A. In my individuals do you think you have retired under the presumption, just a ballpark; could you hazard a guess? A. In my time, oh, 35, maybe. Q. Of those approximate 35, are you aware of any other individual who once they retired under the presumption was not granted 111F benefits? A. I'm not aware of any. MR. SACCO: Thank you. MR. SILVERFINE: I have no further questions. Thank you. (Whereupon, the deposition was concluded at 12:40 p.m.)	23	Q. Were there two rulings in Mr. Kelley's	23	
Page 62 A. Two rulings? Q. Yes, one on the presumption and one as to actual injury on-duty? A. No well, I'm not sure. It was voted that he retired under Section 7 under the presumption law. Q. Let me try and refresh your recollection. Would you refer to Exhibit 3, second page, last paragraph, "Conclusion and Vote" and where it says, "The Board also concluded that Kelley's permanent inability to perform the essential duties and positions the proximal result of the personal injury he sustained May 25, 2003, while in performance of his duties." A. Yes. And that is, also, based on the medical panel, that the doctors, the physicians, have determined. Q. Further up in the beginning of the paragraph when you mentioned, second line, accompanying the narrative report and medical	24	case?	24	
A. Two rulings? Q. Yes, one on the presumption and one as to actual injury on-duty? A. No well, I'm not sure. It was voted that he retired under Section 7 under the presumption law. Q. Let me try and refresh your recollection. Would you refer to Exhibit 3, second page, last paragraph, "Conclusion and Vote" and where it says, "The Board also concluded that Kelley's permanent inability to perform the essential duties and positions the proximal result of the personal injury he sustained May 25, 2003, while in performance of his duties." A. Yes. And that is, also, based on the medical panel, that the doctors, the physicians, have determined. Q. Further up in the beginning of the paragraph when you mentioned, second line, accompanying the narrative report and medical		Page 60		
Q. Yes, one on the presumption and one as to actual injury on-duty? A. No well, I'm not sure. It was voted that he retired under Section 7 under the presumption law. Q. Let me try and refresh your recollection. Would you refer to Exhibit 3, second page, last paragraph, "Conclusion and Vote" and where it says, ribability to perform the essential duties and positions the proximal result of the personal injury he sustained May 25, 2003, while in performance of his duties." A. Yes. And that is, also, based on the medical panel, that the doctors, the physicians, have determined. Q. Further up in the beginning of the paragraph when you mentioned, second line, actual injury on-duty? Q. In terms of, and I think Mr. Gallitano approached this, in your experience as Board Director, how many individuals do you think you have retired under the presumption, just a ballpark; could you hazard a guess? A. In my time, oh, 35, maybe. Q. Of those approximate 35, are you aware of any other individual who once they retired under the presumption was not granted 111F benefits? A. I'm not aware of any. MR. SACCO: Thank you. MR. SILVERFINE: I have no further questions. Thank you. (Whereupon, the deposition was concluded at 12:40 p.m.)	-			
actual injury on-duty? A. No well, I'm not sure. It was voted that he retired under Section 7 under the presumption law. Q. Let me try and refresh your recollection. Would you refer to Exhibit 3, second page, last paragraph, "Conclusion and Vote" and where it says, mither than the essential duties and positions the proximal result of the personal injury he sustained May 25, 2003, while in performance of his duties." A. Yes. And that is, also, based on the medical panel, that the doctors, the physicians, have determined. Q. Further up in the beginning of the paragraph when you mentioned, second line, accompanying the narrative report and medical M. In my time, oh, 35, maybe. Q. Of those approximate 35, are you aware of any other individual who once they retired under the presumption, just a ballpark; could you hazard a guess? A. In my time, oh, 35, maybe. Q. Of those approximate 35, are you aware of any other individual who once they retired under the presumption was not granted 111F benefits? A. I'm not aware of any. MR. SACCO: Thank you. MR. SILVERFINE: I have no further questions. Thank you. (Whereupon, the deposition was concluded at 12:40 p.m.)				
4 A. No — well, I'm not sure. It was voted 5 that he retired under Section 7 under the presumption 6 law. 7 Q. Let me try and refresh your recollection. 8 Would you refer to Exhibit 3, second page, last 9 paragraph, "Conclusion and Vote" and where it says, 10 "The Board also concluded that Kelley's permanent 11 inability to perform the essential duties and 12 positions the proximal result of the personal injury 13 he sustained May 25, 2003, while in performance of 14 his duties." 15 A. Yes. And that is, also, based on the 16 medical panel, that the doctors, the physicians, have 17 determined. 18 Q. Further up in the beginning of the 19 paragraph when you mentioned, second line, 20 accompanying the narrative report and medical			l	
that he retired under Section 7 under the presumption law. Q. Let me try and refresh your recollection. Would you refer to Exhibit 3, second page, last paragraph, "Conclusion and Vote" and where it says, "The Board also concluded that Kelley's permanent inability to perform the essential duties and positions the proximal result of the personal injury he sustained May 25, 2003, while in performance of his duties." A. Yes. And that is, also, based on the medical panel, that the doctors, the physicians, have determined. Q. Further up in the beginning of the paragraph when you mentioned, second line, accompanying the narrative report and medical		The state of the s	1	
6 law. 7 Q. Let me try and refresh your recollection. 8 Would you refer to Exhibit 3, second page, last 9 paragraph, "Conclusion and Vote" and where it says, 10 "The Board also concluded that Kelley's permanent 11 inability to perform the essential duties and 12 positions the proximal result of the personal injury 13 he sustained May 25, 2003, while in performance of 14 his duties." 15 A. Yes. And that is, also, based on the 16 medical panel, that the doctors, the physicians, have 17 determined. 18 Q. Further up in the beginning of the 19 paragraph when you mentioned, second line, 20 accompanying the narrative report and medical 6 retired under the presumption, just a ballpark; could 7 you hazard a guess? 8 A. In my time, oh, 35, maybe. 9 Q. Of those approximate 35, are you aware of 10 any other individual who once they retired under the 11 presumption was not granted 111F benefits? 12 A. I'm not aware of any. 13 MR. SACCO: Thank you. 14 MR. SILVERFINE: I have no further 15 questions. Thank you. 16 (Whereupon, the deposition 17 was concluded at 12:40 p.m.) 18 paragraph when you mentioned, second line, 20 accompanying the narrative report and medical				
Q. Let me try and refresh your recollection. Would you refer to Exhibit 3, second page, last paragraph, "Conclusion and Vote" and where it says, right and paragraph, "Conclusion and Vote" and where it says, right board also concluded that Kelley's permanent inability to perform the essential duties and positions the proximal result of the personal injury he sustained May 25, 2003, while in performance of his duties." A. Yes. And that is, also, based on the medical panel, that the doctors, the physicians, have determined. Q. Further up in the beginning of the paragraph when you mentioned, second line, accompanying the narrative report and medical		-	1	
Would you refer to Exhibit 3, second page, last paragraph, "Conclusion and Vote" and where it says, The Board also concluded that Kelley's permanent inability to perform the essential duties and positions the proximal result of the personal injury he sustained May 25, 2003, while in performance of his duties." A. Yes. And that is, also, based on the medical panel, that the doctors, the physicians, have determined. Q. Further up in the beginning of the paragraph when you mentioned, second line, accompanying the narrative report and medical A. In my time, oh, 35, maybe. Q. Of those approximate 35, are you aware of any other individual who once they retired under the presumption was not granted 111F benefits? A. I'm not aware of any. MR. SILVERFINE: I have no further questions. Thank you. (Whereupon, the deposition was concluded at 12:40 p.m.) 18 19 20 accompanying the narrative report and medical	7	•	6	
9 paragraph, "Conclusion and Vote" and where it says, 10 "The Board also concluded that Kelley's permanent 11 inability to perform the essential duties and 12 positions the proximal result of the personal injury 13 he sustained May 25, 2003, while in performance of 14 his duties." 15 A. Yes. And that is, also, based on the 16 medical panel, that the doctors, the physicians, have 17 determined. 18 Q. Further up in the beginning of the 19 paragraph when you mentioned, second line, 20 accompanying the narrative report and medical	0		7	
10 "The Board also concluded that Kelley's permanent inability to perform the essential duties and positions the proximal result of the personal injury his duties." 12 positions the proximal result of the personal injury his duties." 13 he sustained May 25, 2003, while in performance of his duties." 14 his duties." 15 A. Yes. And that is, also, based on the medical panel, that the doctors, the physicians, have determined. 16 Q. Further up in the beginning of the paragraph when you mentioned, second line, accompanying the narrative report and medical panel. 10 any other individual who once they retired under the presumption was not granted 111F benefits? 12 A. I'm not aware of any. 13 MR. SACCO: Thank you. 14 MR. SILVERFINE: I have no further questions. Thank you. 16 (Whereupon, the deposition was concluded at 12:40 p.m.) 18 19 paragraph when you mentioned, second line, accompanying the narrative report and medical			ł	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
11 inability to perform the essential duties and 12 positions the proximal result of the personal injury 13 he sustained May 25, 2003, while in performance of 14 his duties." 15 A. Yes. And that is, also, based on the 16 medical panel, that the doctors, the physicians, have 17 determined. 18 Q. Further up in the beginning of the 19 paragraph when you mentioned, second line, 20 accompanying the narrative report and medical 11 presumption was not granted 111F benefits? A. I'm not aware of any. MR. SILVERFINE: I have no further 15 questions. Thank you. 16 (Whereupon, the deposition 17 was concluded at 12:40 p.m.) 18 19 20		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1	
12 positions the proximal result of the personal injury 13 he sustained May 25, 2003, while in performance of 14 his duties." 15 A. Yes. And that is, also, based on the 16 medical panel, that the doctors, the physicians, have 17 determined. 18 Q. Further up in the beginning of the 19 paragraph when you mentioned, second line, 20 accompanying the narrative report and medical 12 A. I'm not aware of any. 13 MR. SACCO: Thank you. 14 MR. SILVERFINE: I have no further 15 questions. Thank you. 16 (Whereupon, the deposition 17 was concluded at 12:40 p.m.) 18 19 20		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
his duties." A. Yes. And that is, also, based on the medical panel, that the doctors, the physicians, have determined. Q. Further up in the beginning of the paragraph when you mentioned, second line, accompanying the narrative report and medical MR. SACCO: Thank you. MR. SACCO: Thank you. Whereupon, the deposition was concluded at 12:40 p.m.) 18 19 20 20 20			i .	
14 his duties." 15 A. Yes. And that is, also, based on the 16 medical panel, that the doctors, the physicians, have 17 determined. 18 Q. Further up in the beginning of the 19 paragraph when you mentioned, second line, 20 accompanying the narrative report and medical 14 MR. SILVERFINE: I have no further 15 questions. Thank you. 16 (Whereupon, the deposition 17 was concluded at 12:40 p.m.) 18 19 20			ı	
A. Yes. And that is, also, based on the medical panel, that the doctors, the physicians, have determined. Q. Further up in the beginning of the paragraph when you mentioned, second line, accompanying the narrative report and medical panel, that the doctors, the physicians, have (Whereupon, the deposition was concluded at 12:40 p.m.)			!	
medical panel, that the doctors, the physicians, have the determined. Q. Further up in the beginning of the paragraph when you mentioned, second line, accompanying the narrative report and medical (Whereupon, the deposition was concluded at 12:40 p.m.) 18 19 20 20				
determined. 17 was concluded at 12:40 p.m.) 18 Q. Further up in the beginning of the 19 paragraph when you mentioned, second line, 20 accompanying the narrative report and medical			l	
18 Q. Further up in the beginning of the 19 paragraph when you mentioned, second line, 20 accompanying the narrative report and medical 18 19 20		- -	i	
19 paragraph when you mentioned, second line, 20 accompanying the narrative report and medical 20				was concluded at 12:40 p.m.)
20 accompanying the narrative report and medical 20		_ _ _		
A T DECORDS THE (IDMINISTRATE COURSE) and provisions 1.7.1		·		
		records, "The opinion of legal counsel and provisions of Mass. General Laws Chapter 32. Sections VII and	21	1
The state of the s				
, — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —				
24 A. No. VI and VII VII is the accidental 24	4 1 www.	A. 110. VI and VII VII IS the accidental	Z 4	

	Page 65	
1	PLEASE ATTACH TO THE DEPOSITION OF DEBRA J. SULLIVAN	
2	CASE: THOMAS KELLEY vs. TOWN OF PLYMOUTH, et al.	
3	DATE TAKEN: June 9, 2006	
4	DATE PAREN. Julie 9, 2000	
5	ERRATA SHEET	
6	PAGE LINE CHANGE REASON	
,	TAGE LINE CHANGE REASON	
R		
9		
10		
11		
12	=======================================	
13		
14		·
15		
16	I have read the foregoing transcript of my	
17		
18	noted above, I hereby subscribe to the transcript as	
19	an accurate record of the statements made by me.	
20	Executed this day of, 2006.	
21		
22		
23	DEBRA J. SULLIVAN	
24		
	Page 66	
		,
1 2	CERTIFICATE	1
3	I, Suzanne M. Hebert, a Professional Shorthand	
4	Reporter and Notary Public in and for the	
5	Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do hereby certify that	4
6	the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of my	
7	stenographic notes of the deposition of Debra J.	
8	Sullivan, who was first duly sworn taken at the	
9	place and on the date hereinbefore set forth.	
10	I further certify that I am neither attorney or	
1.1	counsel for, not related to or employed by any of the	
12	parties to the action in which this deposition was	
13	taken, and further that Tain not a relative or	
14	employee of any attorney or counsel employed in this	
15	case, nor am I financially interested in this action.	
16	THE FOREGOING CERTIFICATION OF THIS TRANSCRIPT	
17	DOES NOT APPLY TO ANY REPRODUCTION OF THE SAME BY ANY	
18	MEANS UNLESS UNDER THE DIRECT CONTROL AND/OR	
19	DIRECTION OF THE CERTIFYING COURT REPORTER.	
20	Signed and sealed this 26th day of June 2006	
21		
22		
23		<u> </u>
24	Suzanne M. Hebert	

Case 1:05-cv-10596-MBB Document 37-11 Filed 10/30/2006 Page 19 of 19

bosto_{n, com}

THIS STORY HAS BEEN FORMATTED FOR EASY PRINTING

Board quick to dismiss '04 charge against chair

The Boston Globe

By Matt Carroll, Globe Staff | November 13, 2005

When three Plymouth police officers last year accused Thomas M. Kelley, chairman of the Plymouth Retirement Board and a former police officer, of threatening them with the loss of their pensions, the state

The Public Employee Retirement Administration Commission directed the Plymouth system to investigate the allegations, saying they represented a serious charge.

Even before receiving the letter from the state commission, the board held a closed-door hearing, and cleared Kelley of any wrongdoing. However, it did not contact or interview any of the three officers who reported being threatened, prompting the commission's executive director to forward the case to the state's Ethics Commission last summer. Kelley recently declined to comment on the allegations, except to say the dispute is personal and revolves around events that led to a lawsuit over disability benefits that he filed early this year.

The accusation against Kelley - who retired from the Police Department on a disability pension in 2003, and joined the retirement board almost a decade ago – came from Captain Michael E. Botieri in a letter written to

Botieri reported that he had been confronted by Kelley at a police function a few days earlier, on May 22. Kelley was upset with him for signing the nomination papers for a woman who, like Kelley, was running for a

The captain wrote that Kelley grabbed his arm and told him, "I hope you never have a heart attack and come before the retirement board." Botieri wrote the board: "I took Kelley's threat very seriously."

Botieri also wrote that Kelley had made similar threats on other occasions against Detective Stephen Viella, who also signed the woman's nomination papers, and Sergeant Michael Pedell, who allegedly had

Botieri had sent a copy of his complaint to the Public Employee Retirement Administration Commission, and its executive director, Joseph E. Connarton, wrote to the Plymouth board on June 4, 2004, to urge it to investigate. If the charges are true, he wrote, it could have an "actual or perceived impact on the ability of the

On May 27, the day after receiving Botieri's letter, the board met in executive session, and considered letters from two people besides Botieri, according to board minutes. Officer Robert Hicks said there had been a verbal confrontation, but nothing physical, between Kelley and Botieri at the gathering. And Dale Webber, chairman of the town's Insurance Advisory Committee, denied Kelley had made a derogatory remark about the

According to the minutes, Kelley said Botieri had been the aggressor when they met at the police function, and attempted to strike him before being restrained. Kelley also discounted the accusations about the other officers, saying he had only a brief exchange with Viella and he was never admonished by Pedell.

Kelley further suggested that Botieri made the accusation as a way to get revenge for the board's dismissal of an involuntary retirement application filed by another officer.

The board accepted Kelley's explanation. In a July 28, 2004, letter to Connarton, the board said that it found

http://www.boston.com/news/local/articles/2005/11/13/board_quick_to_dismiss_04_char... 11/13/2005

Board quick to dismiss '04 charge against chair - The Boston Globe

Page 2 of 2

The letter noted that "since none of Captain Botieri's allegations relating to comments made to him by third parties were corroborated by the named individuals, the board considers these claims to be hearsay . . . " The board also criticized Botieri for writing his letter on Plymouth Police Department stationery.

However, neither Botieri, Viella, Pedell, nor another officer cited as a witness to the Botieri incident were contacted by the board, the four officers said in interviews with the Globe. All said Botieri's letter accurately reflected what Kelley said to them. They declined further comment.

In August 2004, Connarton asked the state Ethics Commission to look into the board's handling of the allegations. More than a year later, the Ethics Commission will not say whether it has launched an investigation.

In March, Kelley filed a so-called whistleblower lawsuit in federal court against the town and Police Chief Robert J. Pomeroy, saying he unfairly had been denied reimbursement of \$2,000 in vacation pay while out on disability, before his retirement. He said his claim was denied because of previous statements he had made to Town Meeting and the state's inspector general that the chief had been paid educational benefits improperly.

The chief denied taking the money improperly, and the bylaw was later amended by Town Meeting to clarify who was eligible for the benefits.

53

Matt Carroll can be reached at mcarroll@globe.com. ■

© Copyright 2005 The New York Times Company